Vol. X. No. 38 June, 1921

STUDIES

An Irish Quarterly Review

I. Archbishop Walsh and the Irish Martyrs — *M. H. MacInerny*
II. The Passing of President Woodrow Wilson — *Shane Leslie*
III. The Principle of Non-Intervention in Relation to Ireland ... ... — *John A. Ryan*
IV. The Bolsheviks ... ... — *Lambert McKenna*
V. Two Ulster Patriots ... ... — *James Winder Good*
VI. Poetry—The Call ... ... — *George Noble Plunkett*
Nebula ... ... — *Lola Steele-Nicholson*
Sunrise ... ... — *Ella Young*
To a Snowdrop ... ... — *John Carr*
VII. Unpublished Irish Poems—No. 14 ... — *Osborn Bergin*
VIII. Blood Prodigies ... ... — *Herbert Thurston*
IX. The Sovereignty of the People ... — *Alfred O'Rahilly*
X. New Germany ... ... — *Constantin Noppel*
XI. Literary Supplement—
I. Shakspere and Christianity ... — *Arthur E. Clery*
II. An Impression ... ... — *Michael Crevequer*
XII. Reviews of Books.

Dublin—The Educational Company of Ireland, Limited
London and St. Louis—B. Herder
Melbourne—William P. Linehan

Single Copies - - 3s. 6d. net (postage 4d.)
Annual Subscription, post free to all countries, 15s. net.
Subscriptions are payable in advance.

Entered as Second Class Matter at the Post Office in New York.

BROWNE & NOLAN, LTD.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

St. Bernard's Sermons on the Canticle of Canticles. Translated from the original Latin by a Priest of Mount Melleray. Two Volumes. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 20s. net.

St. Bernard's Sermons for the Seasons and the Principle Festivals of the year. Translated from the original Latin by a Priest of Mount Melleray. Vol. I. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 10s. net.

The Golden Key. A short Devotional Commentary on the Lord's Prayer. By REV. P. GRIFFITH, C.SS.R. Paper cover, 6d.; by post, 8d. Cloth, 1s.; by post, 1s. 2d.

Catechism Notes. Second Edition. Revised and Enlarged. With Preface by the MOST REV. DR. MORRISROE, Bishop of Achonry. Paper cover, 6d.; by post, 8d.

The Catholic Student. Lectures on Leading Truths of Religion. By REV. MICHAEL HICKEY, D.D., PH.D., Holy Cross College, Clonliffe. Cloth, net 6s.; by post, 6s. 5d.

A Catechism of Catholic Social Principles for Employers, Workmen, Social Workers. Study Circles, etc. By JAMES P. KERR, LL.D., Barrister-at-Law. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 1s. 6d.; by post, 1s. 9d.

DUBLIN :: BELFAST :: CORK :: WATERFORD

A. THOM & CO., LIMITED,

SEALY, BRYERS & WALKER,
HUMPHREY & ARMOUR,
SULLIVAN BROTHERS,

Printers, Stationers, and Educational Publishers.

"Studies" is Printed and Bound by us and is a Specimen of our Magazine Work.

8 & 9 CROW STREET AND 20 & 21 TEMPLE LANE,
DUBLIN.

HARRINGTON'S PURE CHEMICALS

FOR

Analytical and Scientific Purposes.

Used in the principal Universities and Scientific Institutions.

HARRINGTONS Ltd., Shandon Chemical Works, **CORK.**

London Warehouse: 4 OLIVER'S YARD, CITY ROAD, E.C.

NOW READY.—CATALOGUE No. 2.

OLD RARE AND CURIOUS BOOKS RELATING TO IRELAND.

Including the *Annals*, O'Curry's *Manners and Customs*, Paris Edition of MacGeoghegan, *Catholic University Gazette* (*1854-5*), O'Hanlon's *Lives of the Saints* (complete), Hogan's *Wolf Dog* and *Irish People*. Rare Periodicals and Pamphlets, and a remarkable number of association books. 990 items.

FREE TO GENUINE COLLECTORS.

THE IRISH BOOK SHOP Ltd., 45 Dawson Street, Dublin.

SANDS & CO.

Dante's Mystic Love. A Study of the Vita Nuova and Odes from the allegorical point of view. By MARIANNE KAVANAGH. Crown 8vo, price **4**s. **6**d. net.

The Mass and the Christian Life. By MGR. DE GIBERGUES. Translated by C.L. Crown 8vo, price **3**s. **6**d. net.

A Week-end Retreat. By the Rev. C. PLATER, S.J. Crown 8vo, **2**s, **6**d. net.

The Story of Lourdes. By ROSE LYNCH. With 14 illustrations. Crown 8vo, price **5**s. net.

Sermons and Notes of Sermons. By the late Fr. IGNATIUS RYDER. Cr. 8vo, price **6**s. **6**d. net.

Gildersleeves. A Novel of Girls' School Life. By E. M. WILMOT-BUXTON. Crown 8vo, price **8**s. **6**d. net.

London: 15 KING ST., COVENT GARDEN; and EDINBURGH.

"Irish Messenger" Publications.

The "**IRISH MESSENGER**" pamphlets, some 300 in number, include three penny magazines:—1. The "**Messenger**" itself (monthly). 2. "**The Madonna,**" a quarterly magazine devoted to the interests of the Blessed Virgin. 3. The "**Gaelic Messenger,**" a quarterly religious magazine in the Irish language.

The following are the four last pamphlets of the "**Social Action**" Series:—No. 24, "**Social Reconstruction,**" by American Bishops; No. 25, "**The Future of Labour,**" by Rev. J. Kelleher, S.T.L.; No. 26, "**Rural Secondary Schools,**" by Rev. E. Cahill, S.J.; No. 27, "**The Reasonable Limits of State Activity,**" by his Eminence, Cardinal O'Connell.

"IRISH MESSENGER" OFFICE, DUBLIN.

Maynooth Mission to China.

THIS Irish Mission to China has its College at Dalgan Park, Galway. 300 Students have applied for admission to the College, but we have been obliged to refuse them for want of accommodation. With the greatest difficulty and inconvenience we have provided room for 60 students. We are forced to extend our living space very considerably, and we rely on the Catholic people to assist us. We depend altogether on their charity.

HOW CAN YOU ASSIST?

The best ways for you and for the Mission to China are:

1. Become Promoters of the Irish Mission League;
2. Get and read "THE FAR EAST," our monthly magazine.
3. Assist generously by your contributions.

Write immediately for all particulars to—

Rev. PATRICK CLEARY, D.D.,
St. Columban's College,
DALGAN PARK, GALWAY.

By assisting in this work you obtain the following advantages—

1. You get the Apostolic Blessing of Our Holy Father the Pope;
2. You share in 1,500 Masses every year;
3. Mass is offered every morning at St. Columban's for your intentions;
4. Solemn Requiem Mass is offered each year on the 2nd of November, for all deceased benefactors of the Mission;
5. The Office for the dead is said once a month for all deceased benefactors;
6. Special public Prayers are said each day for you.

Write for Particulars and Information at once.

YOUR AID IS URGENTLY NEEDED.

THE HIBERNIAN FIRE :: AND GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED :: ::

HEAD OFFICES. 48 & 49 Dame St., Dublin.
BRANCHES: Dundalk, Belfast, Derry, Cork.

Policies issued cover **Fire, Fidelity Guarantee, Burglary, Third Party,** and :: :: ::

Employers' Liability Risks.

The PRACTICAL SCHOOL

CONVENT OF ST. LOUIS,

RAMSGRANGE, WATERFORD.

(Under Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction.)

The School for Farmers' Daughters

TRAINED AND SPECIALLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS APPOINTED and paid by Department.

PRACTICAL INSTRUCTION IN MILKING, DAIRYING, POULTRY-KEEPING, COOKING, DRESSMAKING, HOUSEHOLD ECONOMY, LAUNDRY WORK, HORTICULTURE.

30 FREE PLACES AVAILABLE EVERY YEAR, GRANTED BY Department.

Full Particulars from THE SISTER IN CHARGE.

THE

National Land Bank

Limited

Asks for the support of all Irishmen who wish to build up the economic and social life of their own country. If we persist in exporting our money we cannot expect our people to stay at home. Business done with this Bank is at once safe, profitable and patriotic.

RATES OF INTEREST—

Current Accounts :: 2 per cent.

(No charge for keeping accounts),

Deposits :: :: 3½—5 per cent.

According to period.

68 Lower Leeson St., Dublin.

L. SMITH-GORDON,

Secretary and Manager.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION FOR IRELAND.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE FOR IRELAND.

The Session extends from October to June.

For the Diploma of Associateship of the College a complete course of Instruction, extending over a period of four years, is given in AGRICULTURE and its ALLIED SUBJECTS (including Horticulture, Forestry, and Creamery Management), MECHANICAL and ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING, APPLIED CHEMISTRY, PHYSICS, NATURAL SCIENCE, and RURAL SCIENCE (including School Gardening).

A limited number of Entrance Scholarships are offered each year:—

(*a*) In Agriculture and its Allied Subjects.
(*b*) In Science and Technology.

The competitive examinations for the award of the above Scholarships, as well as for Teacherships-in-Training, are held during the last week of June in each year.

The examinations for Entrance are held (1) in the last week of June, (2) in the second week of September, for all Faculties other than Agriculture.

Full particulars of the conditions of Entrance by examination or other qualification, of the examinations for Scholarships, and of the various Courses of Instruction Fees, etc., may be obtained upon application to

THE REGISTRAR,
ROYAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE FOR IRELAND,
DUBLIN.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, CORK

(A Constituent College of the National University of Ireland).

Full Courses for Degrees and Diplomas in

Arts, Celtic Studies, Science, Medicine, Dentistry, Engineering, Commerce, Agriculture, Law, Education, Journalism, Music.

Full particulars as to the Conditions and cost of obtaining these Degrees and Diplomas, with all other information as to the College, its facilities and Scholarships, may be obtained on application to THE REGISTRAR.

The College has a number of valuable SCHOLARSHIPS, full particulars as to which can be obtained gratis, on application to THE REGISTRAR at the College.

The HONAN HOSTEL provides for Catholic Men Students. For Terms apply to THE WARDEN.

A List of recognised Lodgings, approved by the President and the Deans of Residence, is available for the use of parents and guardians.

The College has playing grounds 15 acres in extent, available for all kinds of games.

THE

PATRIOTIC Assurance Company, Ltd.

FIRE, ACCIDENT, WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION & BURGLARY.

Registered and Head Office: **9 College Green, DUBLIN.**

CAPITAL FULLY PAID £100,000.

DIRECTORS—

JOHN MOONEY, C.V.O., D.L., J.P., Chairman. | PHILIP H. GRIERSON, Esq.
LAURENCE W. MARTIN, Esq. | JOHN SINCLAIR, Esq., D.L. (Belfast).
SIR THOMAS HENRY GRATTAN ESMONDE, BART.

Low Rates of Premium and prompt and liberal Settlement of Claims.

The position of the Company is amply secured independent of Capital.

PROPOSAL FORM AND ALL INFORMATION ON APPLICATION TO COMPANY'S AGENTS, OR TO **STUART C. SMITH, Manager & Secretary.**

HERDER'S NEW BOOKS.

THE LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST THE SON OF GOD. In Meditations. By the Rev. MAURICE MESCHLER, S.J. With Maps. Third Edition. 2 Vols. 8vo. 1344 Pages. 18s.

"Meschler is a master in ascetical and dogmatic theology, which he expresses with astonishing fertility of thought and illustration."—*The Tablet.*

"There is no better way of knowing the Life of our Lord than by daily meditation upon it, and under Father Meschler's guidance every aspect and every incident of that divine life is exhaustively considered."—*The Ushaw Magazine.*

THE CATHOLIC MANUAL. A Prayer-Book with Instructions, Advice, and Devotions for the Catholic Laity. By the Rev. TILMANN PESCH, S.J. Fourth Edition. 32mo. 698 Pages.

Cloth. Round Corners, Gilt Edges, 4s. 6d. Net. Morocco, Limp, Round Corners, Red under Gold Edges, 7s. Net. Postage 3d.

"Turning it over and reading at random, we are struck every time with its excellenoe. We could not do better than select this book for the constant companion of every Catholic."—*The Examiner, Bombay.*

THE PASSION AND GLORY OF CHRIST. A Commentary on the Events from the Last Supper to the Ascension. Adapted from the original of Mgr. F. X. POELZ, S.T.D., by the Rev. C. C. MARTINDALE. 8vo. 14s.

"Without question this valuable work should be the property of every priest and ecclesiastical student. To its pages they may turn not only for information of the highest order, but spiritual refreshment and comfort."—*The Homiletic Monthly.*

B. HERDER, PUBLISHER TO THE HOLY APOSTOLIC SEE,
68 GT. RUSSELL STREET, LONDON. W.C.1.

SOME RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

HUNTING MEMORIES OF MANY LANDS. By SIR THOMAS H. GRATTAN ESMONDE, Bart. Illustrated with numerous Photographs by the Author. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. By post, 11s.

THE INCREASE OF RENT ACT, 1920. By JAMES CREED MEREDITH, Litt.D., K.C., and HECTOR S. J. HUGHES, B.L. Fully annotated. Complete Analysis and Exposition of the Act and Index. Crown 8vo. 6s. By post, 6s. 3d.

RUBY-LAURE: A French Impression of Ireland. By V. DE SAINT-HELME. French Text. Crown 8vo. With Illustrations by Irish Artists. 3s. 6d. By post, 3s 9d.

A most sympathetic attempt to portray the Country as it appears to-day to a visitor.

RUBY-LAURE. Translated into English by MILLICENT A. HARTE. Crown 8vo. With Illustrations by Irish Artists. 3s. 6d. By post, 3s. 9d.

ALEX. THOM & CO., Ltd., Publishers,
CROW STREET, DUBLIN.

A Monthly Magazine Which Should be in Every Catholic Home

The Catholic World

Established 1865

For over fifty-five years the leader in Catholic Literature

Every Catholic should know the great social and religious problems of reconstruction.

As a Catholic he will be asked by his fellow citizens to answer and to explain. All of us must play our full part in shaping the future.

The Catholic World covers these problems: states the principles that guide in their solution.

Besides articles of the more serious kind, it gives monthly the lighter article: the short story: reviews of the latest books: and a summary of current events. A magazine for both clergy and laity.

40 Cents a Copy, $4.00 a Year

Sample copy sent on request

The Paulist Press

Under the supervision of the Paulist Fathers

PUBLISHERS OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS ON QUESTIONS OF THE DAY

Catalogue sent on application

120 West 60th Street **New York City**

TALBOT PRESS BOOKS

EXCURSIONS IN THOUGHT. By "Imaal." A treasury of intellectual wealth, of vast range and variety, and catholic in the widest sense. These essays deal with the principles of Christianity, Literature and Art, and will rivet the attention of all readers. **6**/- net.

THE GLAMOUR OF BELFAST. By Hugh A. MacCartan. **2/6** net. Uniform with *The Glamour of Dublin* and *The Glamour of Cork.* An unique and original series of historical and literary vignettes.

SILHOUETTES. Some character studies from North and South. By Hugh A. MacCartan. **2/6** net.

WHEN YOUTH MEETS YOUTH. By M. MacDonnell Bodkin, K.C. Author of *True Man and Traitor*, Etc. Crown 8vo, **7/6** net.

THE MAKING OF A REPUBLIC. A survey of the American struggle for Independence, giving special attention to the part played by the Irish people in the fight. By Kevin R. O'Shiel. Crown 8vo, **5**/- net.

IRISH UNIONISM. By J. W. Good. Author of *Ulster in Ireland.* **6**/- net.

"His arguments are merciless because they are founded on fact."—*Irish Independent.*

THE SWORD OF O'MALLEY. Exploits and Adventures of an Irish Brigadier. By Justin Mitchell. With illustrations by Paul Hardy. **5**/- net.

". . . A grand yarn, This dare-devil Irishman is a second D'Artagnan."—*John o' London's Weekly.*

THE HOUNDS OF BANBA. By Daniel Corkery. Author of *A Munster Twilight, The Threshold of Quiet*, Etc. Cr. 8vo, **4**/- net.

YOUNG HOUSEWIFE'S COOKERY BOOK. By Brigid Russell, Diplomee of the Board of Education in Cookery and Laundry Work; former Principal of the Castlerosse School of Industry, Killarney; late Head Teacher of the Killarney School of Housewifery (Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland). New Edition. Cloth boards, **2/6** net.

THE MISSAL EXPLAINED. By A. Fleury, S.J. According to the Constitution "Divino afflatu," 1911, and subsequent Decrees. Mass, Vespers, Ritual, and all Catholic Devotions. The most complete, compact, and comprehensive Prayer Book ever issued. Though containing over 1,000 pages, it is light and portable, measuring only $5\frac{1}{2}$ by $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches, and less than one inch thick. Prices, in various bindings, **6**/-, **7/6**, **9**/-, **10/6** and **15**/-.

A complete catalogue may be had from The Talbot Press Limited, or all Bookshops.

THE TALBOT PRESS LTD., 85 Talbot Street, DUBLIN.

THE CATHOLIC CHARITIES REVIEW

A Monthly Magazine which Discusses the Facts, Problems and Methods of Charity and Related Social Questions . . .

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION: FIVE SHILLINGS.

Rev. JOHN A. RYAN, D.D., LL.D., Editor and Manager,
The Catholic University of America,
WASHINGTON, D.C., U.S.A.

BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE

GLIMPSES OF THE PASSION.

By RICHARD LYTTON GREAVES. 2s. 6d. and 1s. 3d.

Poems dedicated "CORDI SANCTISSIMO." From Fr. McMullan's foreword: "Thoughts that are really Thoughts—not exuberant sentiments. . ." *A June gift-book.*

THE LOVE OF THE SACRED HEART.

Illustrated by ST. GERTRUDE. 6s.

"This should prove a book of much value to Religious and others, and it is certainly calculated to promote devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus."—*Messenger.*

THE LOVE OF THE SACRED HEART.

Illustrated by ST. MARGARET MARY and the Blessed JOHN EUDES. 6s.

"The Book provides most edifying material for meditation and spiritual reading."—*Poor Souls' Friend.*

REBUILDING A LOST FAITH.

By an AMERICAN AGNOSTIC. 8vo. 10s. *Just published.*

A telling record of the reasons that led to the submission to Catholic authority of an earnest propagandist of Rationalism.

A LIFE'S OBLATION:

Geneviève de Goutel. By MARTHE DESCOUR. With Preface by Fr. C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J., and an Introduction by ABBE SERTILLANGES. 6s. *Now ready.*

MATTERS OF MOMENT.

By the Rev. JOHN MCCABE. 6s. *Just out.*

A collection of short souvenirs of sermons preached in the North of England. They aim at being suggestive rather than exhaustive, at giving illuminative hints not elaborate dissertations.

HENRY EDWARD MANNING: His Life and Labours.

By SHANE LESLIE, M.A. Demy 8vo. With Illustrations. 25s.

"Mr. Leslie has done his work exceedingly well. At last we get glimpses of the real Manning."—*Observer.*

"Not only informative on several doubtful points, but interesting as a picture of a great career."—*Daily Telegraph.*

A STRING OF SAPPHIRES.

Being Mysteries of the Life and Death of Our Blessed Lord put into English Rhyme for the Young and Simple. By HELEN PARRY EDEN. F'cap 4to. 10s.

"A string of gems, quotation from which almost baffles one, so rich is the choice."—*Universe.*

"Effects . . . like effects of sea and sky . . . extraordinarily interesting."—*Nation and Athenæum.*

Other Reviews: "A sheer joy from cover to cover." "Unquestionably a great success."—"A very cheap book."

THE RULE OF ST. BENEDICT.

A commentary by the Right Rev. DOM PAUL DELATTE, Abbot of Solesmes. Royal 8vo. 21s.

"The best of all modern studies of the rule of St. Benedict."—*Studies.*

"Will strongly appeal to all who love the peculiar flavour of Catholic devotion."—*The Christian World.*

THE SPIRITUAL TEACHINGS OF FATHER SEBASTIAN BOWDEN.

Consisting of Counsels on various Subjects. Notes of Addresses and Letters with Short Introductory Memoir. Edited by the Fathers of the Oratory. With Portrait. 6s.

THE BLESSED SACRAMENT GUILD-BOOK.

Instructions, Services, Music, Hymns. Preface by H. E. Cardinal BOURNE. Cloth. 2s. Pluvis, gilt edges, 3s.

A MOTHER'S LETTERS.

A Book for Young Women. With Preface by the late ARCHBISHOP OF LIVERPOOL. By the Rev. ALEXANDER, O.F.M. 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d.

ALL PRICES NET.

LONDON: 28, ORCHARD STREET, W.1., and 8-10, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.4.

Showrooms: 3 Lincoln Place, Westland Row Dublin.

Collapsible Hoods fitted to our Tub or Tonneau Cars.

See Our New All-Weather Tonneau Car.

Gold Medal for Cars at Franco-British Exhibition.

Catalogue from Works: Edenderry, King's Co.

Alesbury Bros., Car Builders.

THE PEACE NEGOTIATIONS

A personal narrative by ROBERT LANSING. 16s. net.

"Deeply interesting and impressive. . . . . It gives us a picture of President Wilson of the most amazing kind, a piece of incidental portraiture worthy of St. Simon."—*Spectator.*

"The book is the work of an able and sincere man with the disillusionment of Paris strong upon him, and it is the most incisively convincing account of the Wilsonian decline that we have had."—*Manchester Guardian.*

"Mr. Lansing's book is certainly indispensable to a full comprehension of the Paris Conference and its work."—*Observer.*

SOCIAL DECAY & REGENERATION

By R. AUSTIN FREEMAN. 18s. net.

An analysis of the changing conditions of Society and an estimate of the probable future course of social evolution with an introduction by HAVELOCK ELLIS.

"One of the most interesting and informing books we have read lately. . . . An admirable exposition of the restless times we live in."—*Daily News.*

BOOKS BY HAVELOCK ELLIS

THE PHILOSOPHY OF CONFLICT. 6s. 6d. net.
ESSAYS IN WAR TIME. 5s. net.
IMPRESSIONS AND COMMENTS. 1st Series. 15s. net. 2nd Series 12s. net.
THE TASK OF SOCIAL HYGIENE. 8s. 6d. net.
THE WORLD OF DREAMS. 7s. 6d. net.
THE SOUL OF SPAIN. Frontispiece. 7s. 6d. net.
AFFIRMATIONS: Studies of Nietzsche, Casanova, Zola, Huysmans, St. Francis and others. 2nd ed., with a new preface. 6s. 6d. net.

BOOKS BY SANTAYANA

CHARACTER AND OPINION IN THE UNITED STATES. 10s. 6d. net.
"One of the most fascinating books imaginable."—*Spectator.*
LITTLE ESSAYS. Edited with a Preface by Logan Pearsall Smith. 12s. 6d. net.
"The wisest volume of essays that has appeared in our time."—*Athenæum.*
THE LIFE OF REASON. 5 vols. Per vol. 15s. net.
INTERPRETATION OF POETRY AND RELIGION. 15s. net.
SENSE OF BEAUTY. 15s. net.

CONSTABLE & CO. LTD. 10-12 Orange St. London, W.C.2

Are WE - -
Your - - -
Photographers ?

Specimens and Quotations free.

Keogh BROS LTD

75 LR. DORSET STREET and 124 STEPHEN'S GREEN, DUBLIN.
(Next College of Surgeons.)

VOL. X. No. 38.

STUDIES

An Irish Quarterly Review

JUNE. 1921.

CONTENTS.

			PAGE
1.	ARCHBISHOP WALSH AND THE IRISH MARTYRS	*M. H. MacInerny, O.P.*	178
2.	THE PASSING OF PRESIDENT WOODROW WILSON	*Shane Leslie, M.A.*	191
3.	THE PRINCIPLE OF NON-INTERVENTION IN RELATION TO IRELAND ...	*Professor John A. Ryan, D.D., LL.D.*	205
4.	THE BOLSHEVIKS	*Lambert McKenna, S.J., M.A.*	218
5.	TWO ULSTER PATRIOTS	*James Winder Good*	239
6.	POETRY—THE CALL	*George Noble Plunkett*	253
	NEBULA	*Lola Steele-Nicholson*	254
	SUNRISE	*Ella Young*	255
	TO A SNOWDROP	*John Carr, C.SS.R.*	256
7.	UNPUBLISHED IRISH POEMS—NO. 14	*Professor Osborn Bergin, PH.D.*	257
8.	BLOOD PRODIGIES	*Herbert Thurston, S.J.*	260
9.	THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE ...	*Professor Alfred O'Rahilly, M.A.*	277
10.	NEW GERMANY	*Constantin Noppel, S.J.*	288
11.	LITERARY SUPPLEMENT—		
	I. SHAKSPERE AND CHRISTIANITY	*Professor Arthur E. Clery, LL.D.*	299
	II. AN IMPRESSION	*Michael Crevequer*	303

12. REVIEWS OF BOOKS:

Henry Edward Manning, p. 306.—Bealltaine 1916 agus Dánta eile, p. 309.—The Contention of the Bards, p. 310.—Comment la Belgique fut romanisée, p. 312.—Theory of Advanced Greek Composition, p. 314.—The Hounds of Banba, p. 315.—Maria Chapdelaine, p. 317.—The Last of the Irish Chiefs, p. 318.—Ireland in the European System, p. 319.—The Historical Criticism of Documents, p. 324.—A Short Guide to some Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, p. 324.—Ireland, 1494–1829, p. 324.—Sources for the History of Roman Catholics in England, Ireland and Scotland, p. 324.—English Madrigal Verse, p. 328.—The English School of Lutenist Song Writers, p. 328.—Twelve Good Musicians, p. 328.—Dictionary of Musical Compositions and Composers, p. 328.—The Rose of Heaven, p. 329.—The New Rubaiyat and Other Poems, p. 330.—Modern Democracies, p. 331.—Weltfreimaurerei, Weltrevolution, Weltrepublik, p. 333.

STUDIES is published in the months of March, June, September and December.

Single Copies - - 3s. 6d. net (postage 4d.).
Annual Subscription, post free to all countries, 15s. net.

Editorial Offices: 35 Lower Leeson Street, Dublin.
Publishing Offices: The Educational Company of Ireland Ltd., 89 Talbot Street, Dublin.

A little symbol that means much to you

The mark of origin beneath can only be used in connection with goods manufactured in Ireland. It signifies that Irish Capital and Irish Labour have produced these goods and that the purchase price paid for them will remain in Ireland.

The money you earn, if spent on imported goods, leaves Ireland. Keep as much of it as possible in the country—it will come back to you again later on. It will help to develop Irish Industry, and directly or indirectly you will benefit by that.

¶ Goods on which this mark appears represent your full money's worth.

☞ Ask for them every time.

A Complete List

of goods of Irish Manufacture bearing this mark will be sent you post free on application to

THE IRISH INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION,
INCORP.,
102 Grafton St., Dublin.

Look for it on the Goods you buy.

McC.

ARCHBISHOP WALSH AND THE IRISH MARTYRS.

BY M. H. MACINERNY, O.P.

Vice-Postulator of the Cause of the Irish Martyrs.

IT is well known that the great Archbishop of Dublin who has gone to his rest was keenly interested in the cause of the Irish martyrs. It is not so generally known that his interest in this work, which he rightly regarded as at once national and religious, was shown on every fitting occasion during the last thirty years of his life. In fact, the task to which his energies were chiefly and unsparingly directed during the last five years of his episcopate, the task on whose accomplishment he had set his heart, was the carrying out of what is called the Apostolic Process on behalf of the Irish Martyrs. This involved the compilation of an orderly and voluminous mass of evidence, drawn from innumerable sources, concerning 260 persons or groups of persons, who had suffered for the Faith in Ireland from the days of Elizabeth to those of George I. Archbishop Walsh was not spared to finish this labour of love, for such it certainly was to him. But he died with the consolation of knowing that he had performed by far the larger and more arduous portion of the task, and that relatively little remained to be done. The Archbishop's future biographer will have ample material for an interesting chapter, or series of chapters, on this head. I can attempt only a rough and fragmentary account of the activities of the Cultores Martyrum, among whom Archbishop Walsh is entitled to a foremost place.

To Cardinal Moran belongs the lion's share of credit for the preliminary work. It was he who paved the way

for a juridical investigation and brought the cause of the Irish Martyrs into the realm of practical politics. For more than forty years he laboured on their behalf with unflagging zeal. In most of his writings—such as his *Memoir of Oliver Plunkett* (1861), his *Archbishops of Dublin* (1864), his *Spicilegium Ossoriense* in three volumes (1874, 1878, 1884), his edition of Rothe's *Analecta* (1884), and his *Persecutions of Irish Catholics* (new edition, 1907) —we may discern a distinct desire to illustrate the history of the Irish Martyrs, and to garner materials which might one day prove helpful to their cause. His solicitude continued unabated until the end. Only a few years before his death, he gave evidence on their behalf before a commission at Sydney, and his testimony is duly recorded in the *Summarium*. But he did more than this. He and Cardinal Cullen raised a fund which was intended to go some way towards defraying the heavy costs and charges of so laborious an inquiry as a critical investigation of the history of our Irish Martyrs must necessarily be; and I have good reason to know that the fund so raised sufficed for most of the expenses incidental to the cause of B. Oliver Plunkett down to October, 1918.

Cardinal Moran was obviously the prelate to whom Fr. Denis Murphy, S.J., referred in an article written at the close of 1891 :—

> Some years ago one of our bishops, who had very special facilities for completing such a task, began the preparation of a history of our martyrs, with the ulterior object of bringing their cause before the tribunal of the Holy See. Other duties, however, called him away; not, however, before he left us a most valuable history of three of them, and republished a work hitherto exceedingly rare, containing the best history of the martyrs up to the time when its author wrote—the early years of the seventeenth century. A few years ago the work was resumed. The documents bearing on the cases have been collected together, the list of martyrs duly made out, and the preliminary court of inquiry will be held here immediately.[1]

[1] *Irish Eccl. Record*, Jan. 1892, p. 44.

Fr. Denis Murphy was in charge of the case for the Martyrs at this time. He was one of the finest scholars among Irish Jesuits of the nineteenth century, as is amply attested by the array of learned works which bear his name. His posthumous volume, entitled *Our Martyrs* and published in 1896, has proved highly useful to later investigators. It is a handy compendium of the lives and sufferings of the Martyrs, and a guide to the principal sources of information concerning them. As far back as 1868, Major Myles O'Reilly, the gallant defender of Spoleto, had published his *Sufferers for the Catholic Faith in Ireland*, an excellent work which is scarcely second to Fr. Murphy's in interest and value.

A preliminary court of inquiry was held in 1892, under the presidency of Bishop Donnelly, but its proceedings proved abortive. Only thirteen sessions were held and three witnesses examined, when the court adjourned *sine die*. Indeed, the time was hardly ripe for such an enterprise. Very few scholars—except Cardinal Moran, who was then in Australia, "on the far-off side of the round world"—had devoted their energies to research on the subject of the Irish Martyrs. Fr. Denis Murphy, the Vice-Postulator of the cause, had collected a good deal of material; but he was debarred by his office from giving evidence *in propria persona;* and he stood almost alone. His untimely death, on 18th May, 1896, brought matters definitely to a standstill.

Nearly ten years passed before the proceedings were resumed, this time in real earnest, and with a strong probability of success. Several scholars had been at work in the meantime, gleaning every scrap of information they could find in regard to the Irish Martyrs. In 1902 it was determined to begin afresh, and to institute what is called an Ordinary Process for the Martyrs who had given their lives for the Faith in Ireland from the days of Henry VIII. to those of George I. Archbishop Walsh was entrusted by his brother Bishops with the supreme

direction of the work. Dublin, of course, was the most convenient centre. Apart from this, the Archbishop's eminently legal mind rendered his selection imperative; he was obviously the one man in all Ireland best qualified for so complex and delicate a task.

Meanwhile the cause of Primate Oliver Plunkett, which had originally figured in the English list, had been formally "introduced" before the Sacred Congregation of Rites in December, 1886. It was now withdrawn from the English list and treated as an independent unit. Cardinal Moran, who was in Europe at the time, displayed a lively interest in the cause, and probably had much to do with its transference to the jurisdiction of Cardinal Logue, who was now empowered by the Holy See to hold an Apostolic Process for the Beatification of his martyred predecessor. In 1902, therefore, by a curious coincidence, Cardinal Logue was deputed by the Holy See to hold an Apostolic Process regarding the Ven. Oliver Plunkett, and Archbishop Walsh of Dublin was deputed by his brother Bishops to hold an Ordinary Process regarding all the rest of the Irish Martyrs. Cardinal Moran's infectious enthusiasm had probably something to do with one result as with the other.

A word in explanation of these Processes may be in place here. An Ordinary Process is supposed to be held by authority of the Ordinary, that is, of the local Bishop. It is a mere preliminary inquiry; its results are transmitted to Rome, where they are carefully scrutinised by skilled experts. If a *prima facie* case is made out on behalf of a particular Martyr or list of Martyrs, the cause is formally "introduced" before the Congregation of Rites. The succeeding investigation is entrusted to a particular Bishop, who is deputed by the Holy See to hold a most searching and critical inquiry. This inquiry is called an Apostolic Process, because held by authority of the Apostolic See. If it were permissible to use a lame and irreverent comparison, one might borrow an

illustration from the proceedings in a magistrate's court, where a man is committed for trial to the assizes. The Ordinary Process is the magistrate's court; the subsequent scrutiny of evidence in Rome is like the deliberation of a grand jury, intent on finding whether a "true bill" should be returned or not. When a "true bill" is returned, the case is searchingly investigated at the assizes—which correspond, in their degree, to the Apostolic Process. The judge, however, in the Apostolic Process is not entitled to pronounce sentence on the merits of the case (or cases) before him; he must forward the entire body of evidence to Rome, where the real battle of giants takes place. In Rome the evidence will be printed, reported on, criticised, and debated, until, after being discussed and dissected by some of the keenest intellects in Christendom, a final verdict is reached on one side or the other.

Let us leave Cardinal Logue placidly directing his Apostolic Process on behalf of the Ven. Oliver Plunkett at Armagh in 1902 or later, and occasionally enlivening the proceedings with one of those pleasant sallies for which his Eminence is so well known; and let us return to Dublin, where Archbishop Walsh is about to begin the immense task of taking evidence in an Ordinary Process on behalf of hundreds of Martyrs. (Needless to say, I use the word Martyrs throughout this article in a convenient popular sense, without the faintest desire of forestalling the Church's decision on any particular case). In 1902, Mgr. William H. Murphy, D.D., Rector of the Irish College in Rome, was appointed to the office of Postulator, and Cardinal Vincenzo Vannutelli became Ponente or Relator of the cause.

In January, 1903, at Cardinal Moran's suggestion, Archbishop Walsh published the first list of Irish Martyrs, prefaced by a lucid and masterly article, which may still be read with profit.[1] In this article he paid a reasoned and generous tribute to the invaluable services which

[1] *Irish Eccl. Record*, Jan. 1903.

Cardinal Moran had rendered to the cause,—for Archbishop Walsh was too noble-minded a man to deny honour where honour was due. The article is also notable for its luminous and well-balanced exposition of the canonical procedure by which a martyr is raised to the Church's altars. Incidentally, the Archbishop relates the vicissitudes of the cause of the English Martyrs, among whom the Ven. Oliver Plunkett was still numbered in 1886, when his cause was formally introduced.

On December 8, 1903, Mgr. Murphy, then Postulator in Rome, appointed Fr. John S. Conmee, S.J., afterwards Provincial of the Irish Jesuits, to act as Vice-Postulator in Ireland. This meant that the case for the Martyrs was placed in Fr. Conmee's hands. He was leading counsel, junior counsel, and attorney, all in one. His duties were multifarious. The general conduct of the case, the policy and strategy of it, rested mainly with him. It was his business to seek out the best scholars he could find, and instruct them in the proper mode of preparing and presenting their evidence. He had to keep in constant touch with the witnesses, as these scholars were designated, and to have them ready when required for examination. He was obliged to attend every session of the Archbishop's court, in order to make formal applications, to introduce each witness in turn, and so on. He needed a working knowledge of the historical evidence for the Martyrs, as well as an exact knowledge of the somewhat thorny procedure to be followed in the inquiry. In a word, he needed to combine the functions of historian, lawyer, and man of business.

The difficulties of his position were enhanced by the fact that he was not permitted to be present at the actual examination of any witness. In this respect, the law seems to load the dice against the promoters of a cause; but the object of the law is no less praiseworthy than obvious. It is to prevent, as far as may be done by human means, all possibility of collusion or fraud. This end

is attained by imposing a rigid obligation of secrecy on all judges, witnesses, and officials; and by excluding the Vice-Postulator, who is not bound to secrecy, from the actual hearing of evidence.

In December, 1903, shortly after his formal appointment, Fr. Conmee invited the co-operation of a number of scholars as witnesses in the cause, and explained the nature of the evidence required. On Feb. 1, 1904, Pius X granted faculties for the setting up of an Ordinary Process on behalf of the Irish Martyrs. On Feb. 16, Archbishop Walsh issued a rescript constituting the diocesan court with a view to the holding of this Process; and the first session was held on Feb. 18. The court was composed as follows :—

Judge—His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin.

Judex delegatus—Mgr. Miles MacManus, P.P., V.G.

Judices adjuncti—Rev. Michael Hickey, D.D., Clonliffe College; Rev. Michael Cronin, D.D., Clonliffe College.

Promotor Fidei—Very Rev. Terence Canon O'Donnell, D.D., P.P., subsequently Mgr. and V.G.

Notarii actuarii—Very Rev. Cornelius Ryan, P.P., Dolphin's Barn; Rev. Thomas Ryan, Chaplain to Warrenmount Convent; now C.C., Westland Row.

Cursor—Rev. Denis Pettit, Chaplain to the Archbishop; now P.P. of Fairview, Canon, and V.F.

Notarii adjuncti—Rev. William Landers, Chaplain to Mater Misericordiae Hospital; now C.C., Westland Row; Rev. Joseph Gorman, Chaplain; now C.C., Berkeley Street; Rev. Jeremiah MacCarthy, Chaplain to Blind Asylum, Merrion; now C.C., Blackrock.

Scribae—Rev. Andrew Moriarty, B.A., Clonliffe College; now C.C., St. Agatha's, North William Street; Mr. Philip A. Cahill.

Vice-Postulator and Portitor—Rev. John S. Conmee, S.J.; died 13th May, 1910.

Postulator—Mgr. William H. Murphy, D.D., Rector, Irish College, Rome; died 7th July, 1905. He was succeeded in the double office of Rector and Postulator by Mgr. Michael O'Riordan, D.D., D.Ph.

Twenty witnesses, of whom thirteen have since died, gave evidence in favour of the Martyrs in 1904. They were examined in the following order :—

1. The late Canon Quinn, P.P., Ballybrack, co. Dublin.
2. Rev. Reginald Walsh, O.P., S.T.M.
3. The late Dr. Donnelly, Bishop of Canea ; died March 28, 1920.
4. The late Fr. Edmund Hogan, S.J. ; died Nov. 26, 1917.
5. The late Judge Browne, County Court Judge of Kerry.
6. The late Rev. Daniel Athanasius Donovan, O.Cist.
7. The late Mgr. James J. Kelly, V.G., Dean of Elphin.
8. Rev. James Patrick Rushe, O.D.C.
9. The late Dr. O'Doherty, Bishop of Derry.
10. Very Rev. Canice O'Gorman, O.S.A.
11. The late Fr. Thomas O'Reilly, O.F.M. ; died 1917.
12. Mgr. J. J. Ryan, sometime President of Thurles College.
13. The late Mgr. O'Laverty, of Down and Connor.
14. The late Rev. Timothy Lee, P.P., Croom.
15. The late Dr. Healy, Archbishop of Tuam.
16. Rt. Hon. Dr. Cox, P.C.
17. Count Plunkett.
18. Sir Thomas H. Grattan Esmonde, M.P.
19. The late Canon O'Hanlon, P.P., Sandymount.
20. The late Cardinal Moran, Archbishop of Sydney.

During practically the whole of 1904—from Feb. 18 until Dec. 13, to be precise—the work went briskly on, three or more sessions being usually held each week, except in the holiday season of August and September. Once the Archbishop had taken up a work of this kind, he was not the man to tolerate any slackness in its performance. Eighty sessions in all were held, the last being on Dec. 23, 1904, when the acts of the Process, in 14 bound volumes, were sealed with meticulous care and entrusted to Fr. Conmee for conveyance to Rome. These acts, for an Ordinary Process, were fairly voluminous. The originals are preserved at Archbishop's House ; the transcript forwarded to Rome ran to 1463 folio pages. Over 460 cases of reputed martyrdom were examined in course of the inquiry ; 309 of these

were formally put forward, but the number relied on was only 292. I may say here, by way of parenthesis, that 258 of these cases were eventually introduced.

Immediately after the Christmas holidays, the Archbishop sent a circular letter (dated 11 Jan., 1905) to the Irish Bishops, informing them that the Ordinary Process was completed, that its acts were to be transmitted to Rome without delay, and that funds would be needed in the near future to defray the necessarily heavy expenses of translation, printing, lawyers' fees, etc., in Rome. The costs and charges had been hitherto met by a fund raised many years before by Cardinal Moran, when Bishop of Ossory. In response to this appeal, a sum of over £1,300 was collected among the Irish dioceses, and a later contribution of £528 from the religious orders brought the total well over £1,800.

The transcript was taken to Rome by Fr. Conmee in January and February, 1905. By virtue of special facilities from the Foreign Office, he was made a King's Messenger for the occasion, and was thus enabled to convey his precious burden in a diplomatic mail-bag, without interference from customs officials at any frontier, until he reached the British Embassy at Rome, whence he conveyed the transcript, safe and unopened, to the Congregation of Rites. Here the acts were translated, and carefully scrutinised, to see that all legal formalities had been duly complied with. At a later stage, the purely formal passages were struck out, and the evidential part printed in a massive volume of 1490 + 23 pages, known as the *Summarium*, of which a new impression was issued in 1914.

Meanwhile the ability and celerity with which the acts were handled in Rome were really remarkable. Difficulties arose at the outset. Mgr. Martini was entrusted with the working up of the case by Mgr. O'Riordan, who had become Postulator in Feb., 1906, after the death of Mgr. Murphy. But Mgr. Martini

did not prove a very satisfactory advocate. He had too many other cases in hands, and could not devote the necessary time to a case of such magnitude and complexity as that of the Irish Martyrs. Besides, his health was failing; he died in January, 1909. His place was taken by an able young advocate, Mgr. Carlo Salotti, now Assessor of the Congregation of Rites, and one of the busiest, as he is certainly one of the most gifted and versatile, of Roman ecclesiastics. His assistant in preparing a statement of the case for the Irish Martyrs was D. Massimiliano Colacicchi. The Promotor Fidei, popularly known as the "Devil's Advocate," was Mgr. Alessandro Verde. The Sub-Promotor Fidei was Mgr. Angelo Mariani.

Mgr. Salotti is fond of telling the story of his first connexion with the cause of the Irish Martyrs. It seems that Mgr. O'Riordan was much dissatisfied with Mgr. Martini and his dilatory ways. At length he hit on the expedient of keeping a little note-book, in which he carefully noted each of the advocate's promises. When the allotted time had expired, he would seek out Mgr. Martini, only to find that little or nothing had been done. To the advocate's excuses and apologies he would reply by producing the note-book and reminding him of the definite promise distinctly made on such a date. That note-book became a terrible source of embarrassment to poor Mgr. Martini. At last Mgr. O'Riordan determined to take the case entirely out of his hands, and to secure the services of Mgr. Salotti instead. But a strict code of etiquette prevails among Roman advocates, as among doctors and lawyers everywhere, forbidding them to meddle with a case on which a colleague is already engaged. When Mgr. O'Riordan heard of this, he stormed, and threatened to report the whole matter to the Pope. The officials and advocates knew very well that Mgr. O'Riordan was a man of his word; so, for peace sake, Mgr. Martini begged Mgr. Salotti to take over

the case of the Irish Martyrs, as he himself had more than enough to do otherwise. Mgr. Salotti adds that he never gave Mgr. O'Riordan a chance of confronting him with that note-book. The two, in course of time, became fast friends ; indeed, Mgr. Salotti is one of the best friends that Ireland possesses in Rome. In his funeral sermon on Mgr. O'Riordan—for Mgr. Salotti is probably the most eloquent preacher in the Eternal City—he took occasion to tell some home truths regarding England's crimes against Ireland. For this he was denounced to the Holy See by the British Minister—but that is another story.

As early as February, 1906, Fr. Conmee was able to announce, in a letter to the Irish Bishops :—"The translation of the 14 volumes of Acta has been completed. The revision of the translation also has been completed, and a fair copy for official use is now being made out. This probably will be completed before the end of the present month. Next, a summary of the evidence will be compiled by our advocate . . . This, it is hoped, will not take many weeks."

Things were moving swiftly. By a decree of April 7 following, the Congregation of Rites authorised the holding of a canonical inquiry into the writings of the Irish Martyrs. Other official papers relative to this inquiry—notably the instructions of the Promotor Fidei as to the manner of conducting it—were issued by the same Congregation on July 10 and August 4. In obedience to these instructions, the Archbishop of Dublin published an edict (21 Jan., 1907), calling for the production of any writings of the Irish Martyrs which were known to exist. Of this inquiry, technically known as the Process *de Scriptis*, the fourth and last session was held on June 28 following. In the light of present-day knowledge, the harvest of *Scripta* then garnered seems ludicrously meagre.

A landmark in the history of the Process was reached on August 1, 1909, when Mgr. Salotti presented the case

for the Irish Martyrs in his *Informatio*, a printed volume of 234 large quarto pages. The work is an orderly digest of the sworn evidence, an able marshalling of the facts concerning each Martyr. The labour involved in its preparation was prodigious. The evidence for each of the 292 reputed Martyrs, or groups of Martyrs, was scattered through a huge volume of 1490 pages, and required to be patiently picked out and pieced together. The *disjecta membra* had to be formed into an organic body. The salient points of the case for each Martyr had to be stated in terse and vigorous language. Careful references had to be furnished to the numerous passages in which any given Martyr is mentioned in the *Summarium*. All this had to be done after examining and setting aside some 170 cases of reputed martyrdom, for which the evidence was deemed insufficient.

After this worthy performance of a most arduous task, nothing more could be done until April 15, 1912, when the Promotor Fidei, Mgr. Verde, presented his *Disquisitio*, a volume of 309 large quarto pages, written from the standpoint of an official critic. No fairer criticism was ever written. Flaws and defects in the evidence are unsparingly pointed out; technical objections are urged when occasion arises; the critical value of the various historical sources is discussed with keen and penetrating judgment. Yet the writer never attempts to take an unfair advantage; he never indulges in merely captious criticism or special pleading. His work throughout is written with supreme ability; it is a monument of fair-minded criticism. The grasp of Irish history which Mgr. Verde managed to gain in a short time was truly astonishing.

On Oct. 1, 1914, Mgr. Salotti published a dexterous and effective *Responsio* of 277 pages, by way of reply to the criticisms of his formidable official adversary. This reply had a notable effect on the fortunes of the cause; it secured the introduction of many cases which

the Promotor Fidei had sought to exclude. On Nov. 13, the Congregation of Rites issued two decrees allowing the Irish cause to proceed, for the time being, without the "vota" of Consulators and without an actual examination of the Martyrs' writings.

This brings us to the eve of one of the greatest events in the history of the Process. On Feb. 9, 1915, the Sacred Congregation of Rites met, under the presidency of Cardinal Martinelli, O.S.A., as Prefect, Cardinal Vincenzo Vannutelli being Ponente of the Irish cause, to consider whether the Commission for the Apostolic Process of the Irish Martyrs should be signed. The decision, as regards 257 cases, was in the affirmative, 23 other cases being postponed until stronger proofs should be adduced. Among the cases postponed was that of Peter Talbot, Archbishop of Dublin, excluded at the last moment by Mgr. La Fontaine, then Secretary of the Congregation, and now Patriarch of Venice. This irregular proceeding was not allowed to pass without protest; and the cause of Archbishop Talbot was introduced at a later stage.

On 12 Feb., 1915, three days after this memorable session of the Congregation of Rites, the Commission for the introduction of the Irish cause was signed by his Holiness Benedict XV. In a case of this kind, the Pope abstains from using his ordinary signature, "Benedictus PP. XV," and writes instead—"Placet Jacobo." The document authorising the holding of an Apostolic Process is one of the very few that are signed in this way—the Pope using his baptismal name, and speaking of himself, as it were, in the third person.

On the eve of S. Patrick's day, 1915—an appropriate and auspicious occasion—the decree for the introduction of the Irish cause was promulgated, copies being posted on the doors of S. Peter's and of the Irish College Church in Rome. That evening the Irish College was illuminated in honour of the happy event. "In Hibernia, heroum

nutrice " were the opening words of the decree, and it must be admitted that they were singularly well chosen.

Competent observers had reckoned that as many as twenty, or possibly thirty years would necessarily elapse between the close of the Ordinary Process in Dublin and the introduction of the cause in Rome. In other words, it was thought that the cause of the Irish Martyrs was not likely to be introduced before 1925 or 1935. In actual fact, the cause was introduced in 1915, barely ten years after the acts of the Ordinary Process had been received in Rome. " For this rapid progress," as Archbishop Walsh gratefully acknowledged, " we are in great measure indebted to the constant watchfulness of Cardinal Vincenzo Vannutelli, the Cardinal in charge of the case, who was able at various points in its progress to keep it clear of obstacles that might otherwise have led to many interruptions and prolonged postponements."[1] All things considered, I cannot refrain from adding that the promptitude and vigour of Mgr. O'Riordan contributed likewise, and in no small degree, to the phenomenally rapid progress of the cause. In his long labours for the Irish Martyrs, Mgr. O'Riordan was ably assisted by Dr. John Hagan, his destined successor as Rector and Postulator.

Such, in brief outline, is the story of the Ordinary Process, to which Archbishop Walsh devoted more time and energy than the general public ever realised. The story of the Apostolic Process, of which he was the guiding spirit, must be reserved for a future article. Meanwhile, it may be said without fear of contradiction that the Apostolic Process led to a closer sifting of Irish history than it had received at any time since the days of the Four Masters.

M. H. MacInerney.

[1] *Irish Eccl. Record*, Feb., 1916.

THE PASSING OF PRESIDENT WOODROW WILSON.

BY SHANE LESLIE,

Editor of the *Dublin Review.*

THE passing of President Wilson has been chronicled with some pity, some veneration, some contempt and some terror, but it is safe to say that he will be remembered when the names of Presidents Taft and Harding have been stuck like ciphers in the dull roll of history. Of course they will always be able to claim that they were the predecessor and successor of President Wilson respectively. Butt was the predecessor of Parnell, and George V succeeded Edward VII. But there is no analogy. The United States lead up to Wilson and from him they continue perhaps horizontally, but possibly downward. Wilson came to civilise civilisation, and for a time he was the arbiter of the world. For the first time the two hemispheres were convinced of the necessity of a man and of the essentiality of his message. He is no longer essential to this generation. The United States have disposed of his necessity at home, but the message remains.

President Wilson entered into the lives of all men living. Those who enjoyed the chances of personal contact enjoyed a memorable privilege. It fell twice to the present writer to meet Wilson in the White House. On the first occasion the President had agreed to accept a facsimile model of the statue erected in Congress to

Robert Emmet. A considerable and varied committee of Irishmen assembled and were ushered into a room ornamented with the pictures of past Presidents, few of whom from Andrew Jackson had not some Irish connection or association. All must at some time have considered the Irish influence in America. These were the men whose position marked a standing cleavage of the English-speaking peoples and who as American Presidents were as perplexing and perilous to the British Universalism as Anti-Popes to the system of Christendom which demanded to be world-embracing.

With as little formality as the manager of a dry-goods store ushered by his secretary, entered the occupying President. His features were inscrutably bland. He gave the impression at the same time of being unexpectedly delighted at the signal presentation being made to him, and also of being capable of assuming the same transitory transports of pleasure in the presence say of a group of Chinamen presenting him with a figure of Confucius or of English Non-conformists displaying a colossal and heroic statue of the late Mr. Spurgeon. He would have accepted all as part of his world Plan. They had all equally but by diverse ways led up to his ideas. Stranger elements even than Emmet's death cord, Confucianism and Spurgeon's preaching were woven into the web which was yet to cover the earth with a loose fitting League of all-pervading Wilsonism, that League of Nations which was to be neither Patriotism nor Politics, neither Philosophy nor Preaching, neither a religion nor a code, but just a Princeton Professor's meditated response to God, Humanity and the American Electorate.

The President accepted the gift, and also the compliment of one of the Irishmen present who suggested that the head of the idealist patriot was not unlike the contour of the President's own. The President, who was becoming accustomed to being compared to Christ or Lincoln, smiled with generous condescension at a

new, if only a facial, simile. He spoke kindly of Emmet's hopes and ideals, but pointed out that as his clothes were those of a past age, so his thought and achievement belonged to a past age. This he did so charmingly that the impression he left on his hearers was that, as Ireland's past was entwined with the fate of Robert Emmet, so Ireland's future could be very safely left in the care of Woodrow Wilson.

The second time I met him was at the very height and apex of his career in October, 1918, in the thrilling weeks before the Armistice, when the Allies were winning, thanks to his mighty support; when there was really a half-truth in the British Minister's assurance to him that each of his great moral speeches was equivalent to an Allied victory in the field; when Austria was pleading to him for a separate peace; when the great Fatherland of Professors was prepared to throw down the sword at the feet of this terrible but unwarlike Professor enthroned upon the Allied spears; when word had come by trusty messenger from the Pope to say that in his opinion, not of course of an infallible nature, Wilson was the great Statesman of the war. It would be the subject of another essay to show how much the Pope's words and attitude had influenced the President's. The good men were probably alone in their common desire to achieve a peace that should lead to no country's destruction. To each the War brought unutterable yearnings towards universal Humanity. Poised, one upon a temporal, the other upon a spiritual throne, they had sought to slake the whirlwind, but in vain. The curses which are the meed of the Peacemakers were theirs. "Blessed are the Partisans, for they shall be called the children of this World" is the worldly Beatitude. Pope and President from far different poles tried to save not a part as partisans, but the World as a whole. European salvation the different Parts refused to receive from the Pope, who was accordingly labelled pro-German or a British pawn. What the Pope

had failed to achieve from the mediaeval centre of one hemisphere, he waited for Wilson to accomplish from the untried mediating focus of another. For the moment all the roads of the World led to Washington not to Rome.

It was at this extraordinary moment that I was present when two Catholic Bishops, Dr. Keating of Northampton and Mgr. Julien of Arras, paid as it were their visit *ad limina* to Washington. Earlier in the day they had visited the tomb of Washington, the Apostle of Liberty and the founder of American democracy. But in these days it was rather to honour Washington as the predecessor of Wilson that Mission after Mission from the Allies was hurried out to Mount Vernon, carrying votive wreaths and offerings, which were felt to be rather a compliment to the living President, whose good humour all the resources of diplomacy were being strained to preserve. The good Catholic Bishops saluted the tomb not only with flowers consecrated by their touch but with fair and noble speech, which must have been a puzzle to the shade of the eminent Freemason who founded the Republic. In the White House his successor later welcomed the two Bishops with kind words, which would at that moment have been gratefully gleaned by the proudest diplomatists. As the Bishops withdrew, his strain of Ulster Calvinism was melted at the sight of these venerable men who had crossed the seas to add another wisp of peace and goodwill to the gigantic strand he was about to knit round the world, and he blessed them—Bishops though they were. It is not always appropriate for a layman to raise his hand and say "God bless you!" to Catholic Bishops, but the simplicity with which he said it and the respect with which it was received showed the abnormal pedestal on which he stood. The world was already lying under too great a darkness for him to throw all but himself into shadow, but he certainly placed the rest of mankind into perihelion.

On insufficient reasons the majority of the world were convinced that he could and would shortly put all things straight. He was one of those who believed so, and he had every reason for believing so himself. He had put education straight as President of Princeton. He might even have made the affluent and snobbish conditions of an American University democratic. He was on the point of sweeping away Princeton's aristocratic Societies as he was one day to sweep away European Imperialisms, when he was called to be Governor of New Jersey. He had seen his word reform and shake Princeton. He was not surprised later when it actually undid Princes.

Wilson was master of schoolroom rhetoric and of gelded phrases. Governors and Presidents had said the same before, but none had said them so intently. The words of an American official or ruler mean less than the statements of any other men, especially as they are meant for all other men to read. When Wilson at his first Inaugural stated, "This is not a day of triumph; it is a day of dedication. Here muster not the forces of party, but the forces of humanity," he was stating what was not so. The Democratic Party had triumphed, and the forces of the Republican Party were never to relax their hatred and opposition until they had reversed the decision. Wilson spoke and behaved as other Presidents, but he was accompanied like a figure in a Greek Drama by a chorus unheard of all contemporaries, but ironically clear in the light of subsequent events. His speeches like the speeches by Greek heroes were liable to grim and contradictory interpretations and mutterings of future disaster, which a Chorus of Aeschylus alone could interpolate in a literary form, half-comment and half-prophecy. As he went on to say, "Men's hearts wait upon us. Men's lives hang in the balance. Men's hopes call upon us to say what we will do," what an ironic interlude would have been sung upon the Athenian stage. It has become so with half his speeches

and phrases, which in the case of ordinary men would have been forgotten or forgiven, but in his case they live on against the sarcastic background formed of his appalling disaster. His failure and his collapse were not as those of ordinary men. With him collapsed the hopes of a generation. With him failed Humanity. Is it no consolation to say that man will ever hope against hope and that Humanity's failure is that of Sisyphus, and that every failure breeds and inspires the new attempt. But the attempt of Wilson was so colossal that the world does not show anybody capable of renewing it. Harding, the new President, will be wise in his generation. Wilson was not wise in his, and the children of this world had little difficulty in undoing him. Because of that undoing future generations will be themselves undone. Are we not undone in this ?

The great Acts of Wilson which were to salve civilisation cannot take place. The medium, the agency and the supreme actor are now lacking. The League of Nations, American support and Wilson himself are deficient. Only his words, the sepulchral ghosts of his promises, will continue to haunt mankind. The only acts which he notched in history were acts of War, and he only intended them to be preliminaries and means to the Act of universal Peace and national inter-leaguement. For nearly three years he had been angling and shifting for position that America's neutrality might prove to be the footground of peace and the jumping plank of his own deep-maturing scheme. He had angled and he had failed. When his second election for Presidency came in 1916 he stood on his policy of non-intervention in war and on his hopes of making peace. The latter had not been realised, but non-intervention was a fact. He was re-elected on that fact. His failure to pacify Europe was condoned by his achievement in quelling such war spirit as there was in America. In March he took his place as President on a peace ticket. In April he declared War ! Some people declared it was the

reversal of American Democracy. Wilson lost no time in expounding how his act would even bring Democracy to lands which knew it not. If he was admitting America into war, he was bringing Peace to the whole world. He was not being led into the War. It was he who was leading the War itself. He had been educating democracy to save Democracy. There was no sophistry which he or his apologists did not use under that magical and satisfying system, sometimes expressed by the formula "Heads I win, Tails you lose." Wilson's critics and followers were swept into one camp. If he had kept out of war, it was to make the war die of stalemate. If he went into war, it was to clear it up at a stroke. If it was necessary for him to soothe the German-Americans at one moment, it was that he might bring them to a loyal fighting pitch against their kin. If he allowed a passionate hatred to break out against them at another, it was that he might be enabled to save Germany from her rulers by violence at home and in the field. In the end the American enemies of England complained bitterly that he had saved England. England and France have never ceased to groan that he saved Germany by preventing the advance into Berlin. His own claim was that he had saved America. From what? From herself. He had saved Democracy from democracy! Perhaps.

Let it be acknowledged that, whether he saved others or not, himself he eventually failed to save. He had on the whole ignored laudation as he declined to notice hatred. What he failed to discern was that the hatred of him underlying the Allies' sentiment was real, whereas their exaggerated laudation was fictitious. The Allies were human. They had suffered terribly for three years and they lay by the wayside bleeding to death. Wilson's attitude had been nearer that of the Levite who passed by with proper expressions of regret than that of a Good Samaritan, who offered transportation and food supply with a free loan thrown into the bargain. While

Germany ridiculed and foolishly in the end baited the pacifist President, the Allies, England more than France, nourished a secret and contemptuous hate. It was a rooted condition of mind which could not be wiped away by a belated declaration of War on his part. That Wilson had not taken the occasion to enter the war in 1915 was a standing reproach to their cause. There was no real reason why he should not have come into the war then. He had no better, though he had more, reason two years later, except that there was a safe opportunity to win the war at slight cost to America and to negotiate and barter the glory of victory for an acceptance of his world-plan by the broken European nations. Even the Allies would be too broken to be able to refuse. At the same time he could have found reasons to stay out of the war to the end. He had received his second term as an encouragement to do so. If he had done so, he might have been more hated than ever in Europe, but he would not have been much more blamed. In fact if he had stayed completely out, the Allies would have probably showed themselves far more tractable. They might have felt compelled to accept first his mediation, and secondly, his League of Nations without conditions. "When the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be." When the Allies, who had the cause of Heaven written on their banner, were sick, they too were ready to renounce the world of diplomacy and intrigue, to which they returned the moment they felt well again.

It was impossible that they should feel otherwise, given national temperaments. England could just have endured America's salvaging entry if it had occurred in 1915. Would indeed it had been so, for America's sake, Ireland's sake, the sake of Wilson even. But by 1917, England felt some of the mortification of an aristocrat saved from near destruction by a patronising bourgeois. It was no real consolation to say that America was her long-lost child, for the American Republic is and feels

far more that she is the progeny of Revolutionary France. Taking the units in the American race stratification, the element which hails England as mother country is not so large. Other and later and more important strata looked to their German or Irish connection with a deeper passion. In any case the majority of the people did not wish war. The majority of the voters had not voted for Wilson either in 1912 or 1916, but, rightly or wrongly, democracy has its mitigations. No machine has yet been devised which affords true and perennial expression of the views of the majority, if that is the object of democracy. Candidates may be placed in power through the working first of the machine of selection and then of the machine of ratification with the most unexpected results. The democratic choice becomes the autocratic administrator. Against this the aggrieved democracy have no redress except by means of the rare and difficult process of impeachment, which proved unsuccessful on the only occasion it was tried against an American President. That the American electors have a hankering to interfere with their chosen appeared in Roosevelt's suggestion for recalling the Judges, who being elected by ballot in America might seem to pure democratisers to deserve recall, should any of their judgments offend the public will. Roosevelt in the end withdrew this proposal when he saw how far it would lead. Recall from the Presidency remains impossible except at the end of either term of office. A good half of the electorate endeavoured to recall Wilson in 1916. During the war his critics were gagged, for he personified the State in danger; but the feeling for recall smouldered during the whole episode of war and during the Versailles negotiations it broke out in a stifled cry for impeachment. Not until the President and his peccant policy could be placed in the scales of a Presidential election, could the furious and faithless democracy rend the puppet who then carried the Wilsonian banner.

The whole process makes the reader wonder if democracy is worth while. Mr. Bryan very truly prophesied that Wilson would leave no Democratic Party to America. It may be questioned whether he has left much Democracy to the world.

The relations of Wilson with his Secretary of State, Mr. Lansing, have recently appeared in print. They illuminate the last phase but one of Wilson's passing with a deadly glare. Published during or immediately after the Versailles Congress, they would have proved sensational indeed. They read now like the criticism of a drama on the morning after the first night. The plot is already stale. The *dénouement* is done and the hero is dead. We learn from Lansing that Wilson was neither hero nor villain in the piece. Wilson's mind had begun to suffer from irascibility, and rigidity. He felt "increasing reluctance" to take his Secretary of State's advice. He ignored the difference of conditions between October, 1918, and December, 1916. He reverted to his pose as the great neutral, in which case he should have stayed in America, whither everything would have had to be referred to him, as he had hoped during the first years of the war. Lansing noted like Cassandra in one of his memorandums, which read not unlike those which the Chorus supplied to a Greek drama, "I prophesy trouble in Paris and worse than trouble here. I believe the President's place is here in America." Even so his presence in Europe would not have entailed personal participation, had it not been for "pressure of his foreign colleagues." There is this to be said that, if he had not come, the Versailles Congress would be sitting to this hour. In order to satisfy Wilson's hunger and thirst to attain his League, decision after decision had to be made in order to hurry the Treaty in which Wilson was determined to enshrine his League, while the different powers made as good running bargains for themselves as they could. Of the great Plan itself

Lansing had noted : " I am sure that it is impracticable. There is in it too much altruistic co-operation. No account is taken of national selfishness. It may be noble thinking, but it is not true thinking." Already he forsaw the hostility of the Senate on the horizon. Wilson also foresaw it and on his first return in January, 1919, he could hand such a pearl to the Senate as the sentence that " equality of territory or of resources there of course cannot be," which might be on a par with saying : " All men cannot be white-haired and blue-eyed boys." Nevertheless under the platitudes he was weaving a snare from which he hoped even the Senate could not stir. He deliberately tied the League in the Treaty and set out " to employ the general longing for peace as a means of exerting pressure on the delegates to accept his plan for a League."

The League itself showed signs of hurried digestion by the Big Four, who took upon themselves to administer the four quarters of the world. The comely concept of Wilson's mind showed signs of not only having been wizarded but even deformed and disintegrated in a Tiger's belly. A few days after Wilson denounced " the balance of power," Clemenceau revived " a system of alliances." Judicial settlements were to be supplanted by political compromises and diplomatic adjustments. As Smuts took " self-determination " from the President, so the President took " the heir of the Empires " as a phrase to cover the mandatory system from Smuts. Wilson had an ideal, not a programme. His only practical plan was how to hamstring his own Senate and it failed. Lansing's secretly recorded Chorus continued : " When the President talks of self-determination, what unit has he in his mind ? Does he mean a race, a territorial area or a community " ? And again : " What effect will it have on the Irish ? " Launching " self-determination " without defining or limiting its practice was symbolic of much of Wilson's work and in Ireland's case, prolific

in misunderstanding, bitterness and tragic results. As matters stand, it would have been better for the world that he had never uttered that word or made it a doctrine. But no blame can accrue to the peoples, who took him literally. On Wilson the responsibility lies and on him alone. He abandoned his ideal of national democracy for the more practical certainty of international autocracy. The League, instead of an agency to prevent wars, became a force to carry out certain peace terms, regardless of the future. Expediency was allowed its oily way. Wilsonism was mutilated for the sake of Wilson. Peter was robbed to pay Paul. Even the mandatory system was worked selfishly, Lansing says, "to take advantage of the altruism and idealism of President Wilson in order to impose on the U.S. the burdensome mandates." And all the time it was equally to Wilson's credit and to his disaster that "his high-mindedness and loftiness of thought blinded him to the sordidness of purpose." And when the moment came for doing injustice, that an eventual Justice might come, and for winking at the means that the End might not be inconvenienced, Wilson was unconsciously ready to illustrate in his person the grim text *corruptio optimi pessima*. Two or three months of the most precious time the world has never had were wasted drafting a Treaty which in the end was to be rejected by the Senate. There was no American programme, only an abstraction and an ideal, and, lest the American Commissioners might prove over-practical, they were given neither a chart nor a hearing. Wilson ceased to answer Lansing. He gave no instructions, and as late as March, 1919, he "had not made up his mind whether the Treaty, which was being negotiated, should be preliminary or final"! Then he discovered that no preliminary Treaty could end the War without the resolution of Congress. "At this statement the President was evidently much perturbed." His right hand was withheld from snaring

the Senate as he had hoped, while with his left he fashioned the snare at the expense of bribes to the Powers. As Lansing wrote, "To gain French support for the League the proposer of the Alliance was willing to destroy the chief feature of the League." The threat of the Japanese to introduce a clause for racial equality led to what Lansing thought "a species of blackmail." Japan would probably not have made good her threat to withdraw from the League, had she not gambled on Wilson's self-centred desperation and she won—Shantung! General Bliss, the military member of the American Commission, wrote to Wilson: "If it be right for Japan to annex the territory of an ally, then it cannot be wrong for Italy to retain Fiume, taken from the enemy. If we support Japan's claim, we abandon the democracy of China to the domination of the Prussianised Militarism of Japan. We shall be sowing dragon's teeth." Had this been published at the time, the President could hardly have continued, but his Commission remained quiet and obedient in order not to delay the chances of restoring peace. Lansing being a lawyer was permitted by Wilson to confer with the Japanese to try to dissuade them, but they knew their man and reaped their pound of flesh. Lansing wrote that it was "an iniquitous agreement. It would be better to let Japan stay out of the League than to abandon China." There spoke the real America, that once echoed itself in Wilson's speeches. But that real conscience of America had been throttled in "secret meetings of four men who keep no records and who tell different stories of what takes place." If they kept no records, their peoples kept reckonings. "All who sit at the peace table must be ready to pay the price," cried Wilson in September, 1918. Two years later he paid it.

The sequel is too well known for description. The unfortunate President threw himself against the people whose highest ideal he had often voiced, but whose dearest prejudices he had too often violated in practice.

They suddenly discovered that by insisting black was white he had sometimes achieved a grey result. When he had unveiled John Barry's statue he had said : " This man was not an Irish-American. His heart crossed the Atlantic with him. He did not leave it in Ireland," which was as true probably as his contention that the proud aristocratic Washington was a man of the people, the outcome of a poor boy's struggles. Wilson was always ready to re-write history and even fashion the cosmogony anew to fit his dream concept of what should be the Plan of the world. He wished to make the flag of the patriotic and jealous United States " the flag of Humanity." With that flag waving as his almost personal property, he gave Shantung to Japan and refused Ireland a hearing. He drew up a Treaty insuring a permanent division of the human race. He really believed in the formula of " enforcing peace " or, as it was better said in Ireland, in fighting like devils for conciliation ! The conflict of ideal and practice had shown itself in the astounding words with which he congratulated the American soldiers who seized Vera Cruz—that they " knew how to use force like men of conscience and like gentlemen serving fellowmen and not trying to overcome them." It only remained for him as American Commander-in-Chief to issue an order to the troops to turn the other cheek on being struck !

Not that he was wrong in his Mexican idealism ; nor that he could help his clumsy practice in the European arena. Not that he helped a single individual country by his League except those who took advantage of it selfishly, but that his proposals could only be adopted by a whole world jointly. If he was too late in entering the war, he was far too soon in proposing his Plan of peace. The Allies he saved ; himself he could not save. Over his prostrate form the angry and disappointed and perhaps wilful nations march on to find that the ultimate Peace will be much what Wilson dreamed.

SHANE LESLIE.

THE PRINCIPLE OF NON-INTERVENTION IN RELATION TO IRELAND.

BY JOHN A. RYAN, D.D., LL.D.

Professor of Moral Theology in the Catholic University of America.

The pretext of restoring order does not justify intervention on behalf of a rebellious faction against legitimate authority . . . ; however, in case of manifest tyranny, when a portion of a people is unjustly and cruelly oppressed, either by another and dominant portion or by the government, an outside nation may and sometimes should intervene with its moral influence and if necessary by force of arms.—(Theodore Meyer, S.J.: *Institutiones Juris Naturalis*, vol. ii., no. 705).

Just as one individual has a right to intervene to protect another from unjust attack, so also one state has a right to intervene in defence of another weaker state which is being unjustly used by a more powerful state, and also even in defence of the subjects of a particular state when their own government is subjecting them to an intolerable tyranny.—(Michael Cronin, M.A., D.D.: *The Science of Ethics*, vol. ii., p. 656).

THE foregoing quotations are a fair summary of the Catholic principle concerning the right of intervention by one state in the affairs of another in order to put an end to tyrannical oppression. They may also be taken as an adequate statement of international morality on this subject. They would probably be accepted as such by all intelligent and unbiassed persons, non-Catholics as well as those within the Fold; for the principle that they enunciate is based not only upon the positive teaching of the Church, but also upon the dictates of natural reason and the natural law. Space is wanting for an extended citation of non-Catholic writers; but it will be helpful to adduce the opinion of the supreme authority among them on this subject. That is Grotius, who is generally recognised as the father of international

law, and who always endeavoured to square his doctrine with the natural law. When the injury inflicted upon the subjects by the ruler is palpable and disapproved by every just man, he says, an outside state may justly intervene on behalf of the oppressed, even to the extent of making war upon the oppressor.[1] This judgment is undoubtedly approved, at least as a general principle, by every person whose moral perceptions have not been atrophied or perverted.

One actual cause of such perversion is the acceptance of false principles as regards international relations. For example, some writers admit between states only obligations of justice, denying the existence of duties of charity. Their contention is that one sovereign state has no moral obligation toward another except that of refraining from aggression and other forms of injustice. Obviously this is a mutilated conception of international morality. No wonder it has sometimes led easily to the doctrine that no purely moral obligations of any sort exists between states; in other words, that political governments are outside the realm of the moral law.

I.—The Natural Law.

Natural law and natural reason proclaim that states are bound to one another by the duties of charity or benevolence. They are quite as much subject to these duties as are individuals. In the words of Dr. Cronin, "just as individuals are bound to one another by laws of charity, *i.e.*, of benevolence, because of their common human nature, so also states are bound by duties of charity because they are all members of the family of human kind."[2] After all, a state is fundamentally an organized group of human persons. As such, a state has the same likeness to other states, the same need of

[1] *De Jure Belli et Pacis*, II., 258.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 654.

benevolence from other states, and the same power of hurting other states by uncharitable action, that obtain among individuals. Therefore, the obligations and claims in charity are essentially the same as individual relations under the head of this virtue. No one would contend for a moment that two men acting as a unit may disregard those duties of charity to another united group of two men which would bind each of them when acting independently. To hold that, when the number of associated individuals becomes so large and so organised as to constitute a state, they became emancipated from the obligations that bound them in the smaller group,—is the height of illogic and unreason.

A common and brief argument for the proposition under consideration is that the state is a moral person, and hence is subject to the whole of the moral law, including the precepts of charity, just as is the physical or natural person. This position is sound, but the conception of the state, or any other organised group, as a moral person is merely a summary statement of the considerations set forth in the preceding paragraph.

When one reads or reviews the foregoing argument, one can scarcely suppress an exclamation of impatience at its utter obviousness. And yet the principle of international charity is not infrequently denied, at least implicitly, even by Catholics. Jingoism, national self-sufficiency, a blatant national pride, a perverted patriotism that is conceived in terms of belligerency and distrust, and even hatred, of foreign nations, have combined to obscure in the minds of men of goodwill the elementary principles of natural and Christian morality governing international relations. Again and again, prominent American Catholics opposing the League of Nations have used language which implied a disbelief in any moral obligation to the nations of Europe. America is strong enough to take care of herself; why, then, should she be concerned about international peace or the misery that

would engulf the European peoples in consequence of another war? Such was the "argument." It was directed not merely against the present League, but against the fundamental principle and object of any international association.

Let us now briefly apply the moral principle of international intervention to the case of Ireland. A foreign state is justified in coming to the aid of a people or a national group that is the victim of intolerable tyranny and oppression. Such is the plight of at least three-fourths of the people of Ireland at the present time. Therefore, intervention is morally right.

The minor proposition of this syllogism is only too thoroughly proved by the long and sickening series of outrages inflicted upon the Irish people during the last two years by the British Government and by the agents for whom it is responsible. Probably the best summary of this terrible record is that presented in the "Conclusions" of the *Interim Report of the American Commission on Conditions in Ireland*:—

> We find that the Irish people are deprived of the protection of British law, to which they would be entitled as subjects of the British King. They are likewise deprived of the moral protection granted by international law, to which they would be entitled as belligerents. They are at the mercy of Imperial British forces which, acting contrary both to all law and to all standards of human conduct, have instituted in Ireland a "terror" the evidence regarding which seems to prove . . . [Then follows a seven-paragraphed summary which the readers of STUDIES either have already read or do not need to read].[1]

II.—INTERNATIONAL LAW.

So much for the dictates of international morality. What answer is given to the question of intervention by international law? The contention that the present

[1] British Edition, p. 18 (Harding & More). Cf. *Report of the Labour Commission to Ireland* (English Labour Party); *Who Burnt Cork City?* (Irish Labour Party); *Ireland in Insurrection*, by Hugh Martin (Daniel O'Connor).

plight of Ireland is a "domestic question," has been set up by no less a person than President Harding. The plain implication of this assertion is that international law renders unlawful, or at least abnormal, intervention on behalf of either party to a political struggle which enjoys the immunity attaching to a "domestic question." Is this assumption justified?

International law is only in small part a formal code adopted by the common action of the several states. An approach to a partial code was made by the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907. Even the general principles that have been laid down by common consent are very few. For the most part international law differs in form and function from the written statutes of a single state. It consists in the main of unwritten rules whose only expression is found in international usage—that is, "in such international usage as can be looked upon as authoritative."[1] What is authoritative international usage? First, that which is based upon certain principles which are regarded as essential to the existence of the states; second, that which is based upon certain general moral obligations which are universally recognised.

According to the Austinian definition of law, as a command given and enforced by a definite authority, the rules expressing international usage do not deserve the name of law. They are merely "counsels of morality, sanctioned by the public opinion of states."[2] This view is not in accord with Catholic moral philosophy. It is rejected by most international lawyers, on the ground that international usage and international rules are habitually treated as true law, and on the further ground that they do not differ from certain other laws in respect of their lack of "enforcement by a definite authority."

Assuming, then, that international law is true law and

[1] Hall, *A Treatise on International Law*, 1917, p. 5.
[2] Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

in general morally binding upon the nations, we proceed to consider briefly its provisions regarding intervention by one state in the affairs of another.

"*Prima facie* intervention is a hostile act, because it constitutes an attack upon the independence of the state subjected to it." . . . Nevertheless, "there are rights which in certain cases take precedence of the right of independence."[1] One of these superior rights is that of self-preservation. When a state permits its subjects to make an attack upon or to foment revolution in a neighbouring state, the latter may properly intervene in the affairs of the former by such means as are necessary to secure guarantees for its own safety. Another instance would be the flagrant violation by one state of the rights of foreigners living within its territory. On this ground the leading powers of the world in 1900 sent a joint military expedition into China. Intervention for the purpose of checking *illegal* interference by one state in the affairs of another, is likewise sanctioned by international law. The underlying principle is clear and sound. If international law is to be efficient it must make some attempt, must at least authorise the use of force, to oppose infractions of its own primary provisions. This was the principle that Pope Pius IX defended, and this was the case that he had in mind, when he condemned (Allocution, *Novos et ante*, Sept. 28, 1860) the proposition which afterwards was included as No. 62 in his Syllabus of erroneous doctrines. "The principle of non-intervention should be proclaimed and observed." This principle, said Pope Pius IX, is deadly and pernicious, only recently set up by certain governments, and utilised to violate with impunity the rights of other states.

So much intervention international law clearly and expressly sanctions. Does it authorise intervention for the sole purpose of suppressing moral wrong within

[1] Hall, *op. cit.*, pp. 293, 294.

another state, such as brutal civil war, religious perse cution, or tyrannical oppression ? The last-named object applies to the case of Ireland, and to it we shall confine our attention. We should bear in mind that we have here to deal with that portion of international law which rests merely upon international usage.

While the authorities on international law do not exhibit complete unanimity regarding the right of a state to intervene on behalf of the oppressed subjects of another state, they are in substantial agreement.

Wilson : " Intervention on behalf of a party to a civil war is not now regarded as justifiable."[1]

Fiore : " It must be deemed as absolutely prohibited to intervene in a struggle between a sovereign and a people who desire to modify the political constitution of the state or the form of government."[2]

Davis : " Interference in favour of insurgents is never sanctioned. . . . It is possible, however, for a case to exist in which a part of the people of a state may be so oppressed, or persecuted, as to warrant other states in interfering on grounds of humanity."[3]

Hall : " International law professes to be concerned only with the relations of states to each other. Tyrannical conduct of a government toward its subjects . . . has nothing to do directly or indirectly with such relations." [4]

Lawrence : " Even interventions to stop proceedings repugnant to humanity can hardly be brought under ordinary rules, though they may be justified in exceptional circumstances as acts above and beyond the law."[5]

Taylor : " The jurisdiction of international law over what is known as humanitarian interventions rests on no stronger foundation than the theory that . . . any act which amounts to a public scandal, may be dealt with as an offence against the entire body of states considered as a single society."[6]

---

[1] *Handbook of International Law*, 1910, p. 62.

[2] *Fiore's International Law Codified*, 1890. English translation by Edwin M. Borchard, 1918, p. 265.

[3] *The Elements of International Law*, 1916, pp. 102, 103.

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 298.

[5] *A Handbook of Public International Law*, p. 43.

[6] *A Treatise on International Public Law*, 1901, p. 428.

Westlake : "Interference in the internal affairs of another state is justifiable to put down a government, or to put an end to anarchy or misrule which disturbs the peace of foreign countries."[1]

Woolsey : "No state is authorized to render assistance to provinces or colonies which are in revolt against the established government."[2]

To these statements may properly be added the declaration of the Advisory Commission to the Council of the League of Nations, concerning the right of the people of the Aland Islands to a plebiscite on the question of transferring their political allegiance from Finland to Sweden. The Commission decided that neither the covenant of the League of Nations nor the principles of international law recognise either the right of a subject people to self-determination, or the right of an outside state to demand that this right be conceded. The Commission mentions but does not discuss the question whether the oppression of a subject people may not be so great as to create an international question.[3]

From the foregoing citations it is quite clear that international law does not formally authorise foreign intervention on behalf of an oppressed people. The only definite ground that any of the writers suggests as a possible authorisation is the theory that the nations might sometimes be compelled to terminate a public scandal; but Hall declares that this is based upon the fiction that the states form a kind of society, while Dr. Cronin calls the "scandal theory" of intervention an "amusing fiction."

Is the lack of formal and positive authorisation tantamount to prohibition? By no means. The relation of the several states to international law is not that of the Federal Government to the Constitution of the United States. The Federal Government violates the Consti-

[1] *International Law*, 1904, vol. i., p. 305.

[2] *International Law*, 1871, p. 56.

[3] *La Question des Iles d'Aland*, Helsingfors, 1920, pp. 68-70.

tution whenever it attempts to do anything which it is not specifically authorised to do by the Constitution. The states subject to international law are not in a parallel position. To do something which is not expressly sanctioned by international law is not always to violate international law. There may be other grounds for the action, grounds not formally recognised by international law, yet not in contradiction to it; in other words, outside its competence. Hence the authorities speak of causes "outside and beyond" the law. In the words already quoted of George B. Wilson: "Intervention on grounds outside the field of international law must look outside of international law for sanction; *e.g.*, intervention on grounds of humanity or religion."[1]

This general limitation of the authority of international law as regards intervention against political oppression, is confirmed and reinforced by two specific considerations. First, the disfavour with which international law regards this sort of intervention is merely a general principle. The exceptions, in the words of Woolsey, "are of great importance." Political oppression amounting to a violation of the principles of humanity, has in the past been regarded as a proper exception by more than one state, and is so regarded to-day by many writers on international law, when the violation is flagrant. "It is possible, however, for a case to exist in which a part of the people of a state may be so oppressed, or persecuted, as to warrant other states in interfering on grounds of humanity."[2] In the second place, intervention is authorised by a formal principle of international law, whenever a state's internal disturbances threaten the safety and rights of its neighbours. Among the reasons given by President McKinley for intervention in Cuba and war against Spain in 1898 were "the interests of humanity," and "the need of removing at once and forever the constant menace and the burdens

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 63, 64. [2] Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

entailed upon our government by the uncertainties and perils caused by the unendurable disturbances in Cuba." With a slight modification of wording, this statement may be applied *a fortiori* to the present situation in Ireland. The outrages against humanity in that country to-day are a hundredfold more atrocious and more numerous than those inflicted upon the people of Cuba in the latter part of the nineteenth century.

The natural and just resentment which these outrages have aroused among the twenty millions and more Americans through whose veins flows Irish blood, is a "constant menace" to the maintenance of friendly relations between the United States and Great Britain. Less in degree but not different in kind is the detestation in which the present conduct of the British government is held by millions of Americans who have sprung from other than Irish stock. Should friction arise between the two countries, it could much more easily lead to war because of the Irish problem than would be the case if no such problem existed. All intelligent lovers of humanity realize that close friendship among the English-speaking peoples will be one of the greatest influences, if not an indispensable influence, for international peace and the political and social reconstruction of the world. Until the Irish problem is adjusted to the satisfaction of the Irish people, this outcome will remain impossible. Many Americans are irritated by this situation. They believe that cordial relations between the great English-speaking peoples, world peace and world reconstruction, are more important than the freedom of Ireland. Nevertheless, most of them have at last come to see that the settlement of the Irish problem is a prerequisite to the attainment of these cherished international objects.

The Irish question is not merely a "domestic question." Consequently intervention by the United States

is justified by that principle of international law which takes cognisance of the harm done to one state by the internal disturbances of another state.

It must be confessed that some of the most influential elements of the American population have not yet given sufficient attention to this phase of the Irish situation. It is likewise deplorable that these elements are relatively indifferent to the cause and claims of Ireland. In taking this attitude they are recreant to the traditions and the principles of America. It is a far cry from the cowardly silence of our metropolitan journals regarding Ireland to the outspoken sympathy for the Hungarian revolutionists expressed by Daniel Webster, as Secretary of State, in his reply to Chevalier Hülsemann, the Austrian chargé d'affaires at Washington, Dec. 21, 1850.[1] Mr. Webster made it quite clear that the United States was pre-disposed to recognize the independence of Hungary on grounds which were not nearly as strong as those which can now be adduced in the case of Ireland.

While international law does not formally and generally sanction intervention on grounds of humanity, it at least permits such intervention in extreme and exceptional cases. To determine when the situation is extreme and exceptional, is the business and the responsibility of the state which is confronted with the problem of intervention. "In general it may be said that in actual practice intervention becomes a matter of policy. . . . . Each state must judge for itself of the propriety of intervention, or of an agreement to intervene, under given conditions, and must then abide the consequences. In practice it has never been difficult to find an ostensible reason for intervention in the affairs of a foreign state, when the wish was present."[2] It is clear, therefore, that intervention on humanitarian grounds in the present Irish situation, has a rather definite authorisation in the

[1] Moore, *Digest of International Law*, i., 223, sq.

[2] Wilson, *op. cit*, p. 65.

precedents of international practice and in the admitted exceptions to the general principle of non-intervention.

Even if the principle of non-intervention suffered no exceptions and if there existed no favourable precedents, this attitude of international law would not render intervention immoral. No such claim is made by any authority on international law, and no such claim will be defended by a moralist. Non-intervention in such an extreme case as that of present-day Ireland must look for justification to some other ground than that of morality.

The United States has not only the right but the moral obligation to intervene. By force of arms? No; a hundred times, no! The man who talks lightly of making an international war in order to bring justice to Ireland, shows himself indifferent to those considerations of humanity which he professes to invoke. War between America and Britain would cause many times as much human anguish as it would relieve. This statement applies even to the people of Ireland. The sufferings involved in the continuation of the present "terror" to its inevitable end, are surely much smaller than those that would have to be endured if the country became the battle-ground of an international war. In any case, no loyal American wants to see his country become involved in such a war; and no discriminating friend of Ireland will contemplate such a calamity with any other feeling than that of aversion.

Happily for all the nations concerned, intervention by armed forces is not necessary. Formal recognition of the Republic of Ireland by the government of the United States, would be sufficient and effective. Neither in morals, nor in international law, nor in political policy is there any reason why this action should not be taken, and taken at once. There are persons who profess to believe that this measure of intervention would itself lead to war. There is not the slightest danger of such

an outcome. The immediate effect would be to compel prompt action by all those elements in the British population that up to the present have confined their dissatisfaction with their government's Irish policy to verbal criticism and protests. A large section of the supporters of the present government would likewise become sufficiently alarmed to demand a reversal of policy. And the government of the United States would accelerate this "change of heart," if it were to demand the immediate payment of interest on the war loans made to Great Britain.

Until America reasserts her loyalty to her ancient traditions and her devotion to humanity by the entirely regular and entirely safe action of recognising the independence of the Irish Republic, she cannot claim to be a faithful exponent of the principles of political right and political liberty. Until she takes this step, her professions and her achievements during the World War will remain open to the charge of illogic and insincerity.

John A. Ryan.

THE BOLSHEVIKS.

BY LAMBERT MCKENNA, S.J., M.A.

NEARLY four years have elapsed since the Bolsheviks on November 7, 1917, established their power in Russia, and we can now form some judgment as to what that power means for the Russian people. Of reliable information there is an abundance—many writings of the Bolshevik leaders (Trotsky, Zinoviev, and especially Lenin), the Constitution and decrees of the Soviet Republic, and many descriptions of its actual working given by witnesses hostile, friendly or merely curious. The most important fact about the new Russian State is that, in spite of its name and its form, it is in fact—and its founders do not baulk at the word—an Oligarchy. It is an oligarchy more highly centralised and pervasive than any ever yet established, yet differing *toto caelo* from any other in its principles and ideals.

The rulers of the Soviet Republic are the Bolshevik or Communist Party. Though this Party has no official status in the present Russian Constitution, Lenin and the other rulers of Russia claim for it the duty of initiating all the Government policy and of permeating the whole Russian people with the proper Revolutionary principles.[1]

Who are the Bolsheviks? They are a body of men drawn from all classes—nobles, business managers, officials,

[1] For instance, Lenin (*Left Wing Communism*, p. 32): "The dictatorship of the proletariat is carried out by the proletariat organised in Soviets, which is led by the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) which, according to the data of the last party Conference in April, 1920, has 611,000 members. We are afraid of too wide a growth of the Party, as place-seekers and adventurers, who deserve only to be shot, do their utmost to get into the ruling Party. . . . Not a single important political or organising question is decided by any State institution in our Republic without the guiding instructions of the Central Committee of the Party;" and so often elsewhere in his works.

artisans, professors, students [1]—but united by one bond, adherence to a particular social theory which is now generally known as Bolshevism. This bond, however, does not bind all the members of the Party with equal strength. There are some, the High Priests of the New Evangel, who for years past have preached it and striven and suffered for it. These are the energisers of the rest. Numbers of their followers adhere to Bolshevism for less purely idealistic motives; many, such as the police, secret agents, etc., taken over from the old government, being probably self-seekers, others (and they are numerous) being men of talent and character, men who had been of note in business or administration, and who, without any special love for Socialist theory, find in the rebuilding of Russia a patriotic duty or a congenial employment. Of course, membership of the Party implies numerous advantages—for instance the right of carrying arms, greater facilities for food and travel, etc.—but though there are (as Lenin himself admits) many rogues among them, the Communists as a whole are men desperately in earnest, very self-sacrificing, hard-working and willingly submissive to iron discipline. An example may be seen in the decree of the 9th Congress of the Party, urging on the members "to undertake the most inconspicuous and roughest work as being the work of the greatest importance and truly responsible Party work." This spirit is undoubtedly lived up to by great numbers of them.

The Communist Party numbers some 600,000 members, but 200,000 or 300,000 is probably the largest possible estimate of the inner circle, the Mullahs who lead the Faithful in this new Islamism. Though couched in the ordinary revolutionary jargon of Marxism, the Bolshevik doctrine is in its spirit and its dreams not unlike that of

[1] Some see a sinister significance in the large proportion of Jews among them. Without much reason, we think. A race restless and intellectually alert, and specially persecuted under Czarism, is naturally well represented in the Revolutionary party. In any case their proportion among the Bolsheviks is not greater, but rather less, than in the ruling classes of France and England.

the Prophet. This doctrine must be clearly understood if one is to understand anything of modern Russia.

Its essentials are roughly as follows :—The State means of its nature the domination of one class of citizens over all others ; in particular, Parliament, the modern form of the State, means essentially the rule of the Bourgeois or moneyed class. Representative institutions will never (as Reformist Socialists foolishly imagine) transfer real power to the workers, the true creators of the nation's wealth. The upper and middle classes, the officials, the receivers of salaries, the workers in the trades which minister to luxury, the peasants ever conservative by instinct, and the stupid and corruptible slum population will always be able to prevent any radical change in the capitalist system from being brought about by Parliament. Thus firmly entrenched, the Bourgeois have at their disposal also the whole coercive power of the State—the army and police, and all the agencies (education, literature, the Press, the Cinema) which form public opinion and can be used to obfuscate and mislead the workers. Moreover the Socialist who goes into Parliament is generally cajoled or corrupted till he imagines Socialism to be the gaining of certain petty reforms, after which he resists further demands as mere mob-madness. True Socialists will therefore carefully keep aflame in their hearts and spread abroad by agitation of all kinds the sacred fire of class hatred, ever holding themselves in readiness, even if they be few in number, to rise in open revolt when an opportunity occurs. When that opportunity comes, they will seize the machinery of Government and set up a Dictatorship of the Proletariat. By "Proletariat" is meant those, of whatever class, who hold the views which the propertyless class should hold but too often does not hold.[1] The Proletariat,

[1] Though Lenin at times speaks of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat as "the rule of the toiling masses," at others, and indeed most often, he makes his meaning perfectly clear and is not afraid of the word "minority," "class conscious minority," etc.

having seized the State machinery, should immediately dispossess and disarm all other citizens, destroying utterly and without regard to consequences all capitalist institutions and inherited privileges (private property of course first of all) and forcibly mobilise all the citizens of the nation for the development of the nation's material resources. The Dictatorship is, however, only a temporary expedient; it is a form of State, though a Socialist State. When by its means production has been increased (as it will easily be) to a fabulous degree, and when all men have abundant food and raiment, and when the young generation have been trained up according to the New Gospel, then the Communistic mentality will prevail; all will work not for private gain but for the common good, and the Millennium will have arrived when will be realised the great ideal: "From each according to his powers, to each according to his needs." There will be then no need for any form of State, not even of the Socialist State, which will have "withered away" from atrophy.

Such is the Bolshevik theory. Orthodox Marxists (Kautsky, etc.) abhor parts of it as being "unscientific," inhuman and (worst of all!) perversions of the great master's doctrine; but there is no doubt that as a Revolutionary call it is clearer, simpler and infinitely more inspiring than any of the other versions of Marxism.

After the fall of Czarism in March, 1917, the Bolsheviks worked fearlessly and skilfully to bring about their own "Revolutionary moment." When it came on November 7 they arose, and arrested the Provisional Government. Instantly they set about carrying out their appalling programme. On November 8 was issued the decree seizing for the nation and without compensation all private property (except that of small holders) in land, stock, buildings, etc. On November 9 all newspapers except their own were suppressed. On November

10 all civil grades, distinctions, titles were abolished. On November 29 the employees in all large factories, and in all commercial, banking, and transport concerns were directed to put aside the owners and to take over full management. On December 1 commissions in the army were abolished and equal pay established for officers and men, and on the same day all the existing courts of law were suppressed. All this in less than a month! Within eight months, on July 10, 1918, the Soviet Constitution was promulgated.

Though the Bolshevik party are the real rulers of Russia, some knowledge of the Constitution which they have at their control is necessary if one is to understand present developments.

Its unit is the Soviet, a council, municipal or rural. In the towns it is constituted in the following way: Delegates are sent to it by the workers in each large factory in proportion to their numbers (smaller factories and workshops are grouped together for this purpose); secondly, by the workers of each Trade Union; [1] thirdly, by the soldiers who may be in garrison in the town. The general population of the town, voting by wards (apparently by way of representing the consumers' interests), send delegates also, but only a very small number. The Soviets in the village or small country district are elected by the peasants.

All these Soviets, urban and rural, send (proportion-

[1] Trade Unions under the Czar existed only as Revolutionary secret societies and had only a small membership. After the 1906 Revolution they grew rapidly, taking on generally the Industrial not the Craft form of organisation. From the beginning they were Extreme Left in tendency, and came almost completely under the control of the Bolshevik Party. Since the 1917 Revolution all workers must belong to a Trade Union, and at present the majority of the members seem to be not Bolshevik but Menshevik in opinion. They point out that the excessive centralization and bureaucracy of the Bolsheviks acting through the Trade Union officials renders necessary independent organisations of workers, and that such independent organisations are doubly necessary for the large number of workers engaged by foreign capitalists or by small employers (still very numerous in Russia). The Report of the Labour Party's Commission gives a very terrible account of the oppression suffered by the Printers' Trade Union.

ately to the number of the people they represent) delegates to Provincial (Gubernia) Congresses, the Provincial Congresses sending in their turn delegates to the All-Russian Central Congress. The town Soviets—not the country ones—are also directly represented (in proportion to the number of workers they speak for) at the All-Russian Congress. There is also another grouping of town and village Soviet-representatives in Regional (Oblast) Congresses which are subordinate to, but not represented in, the Central Congress.

This All-Russian Central Congress is the supreme legislative and executive authority of the State. By means of its Executive Committee it appoints the 18 People's Commissaries each of whom is at the head of a Commissariat (Foreign Affairs, Military, Naval, Home, Justice, Labour, Social Welfare, Education, Post and Telegraph, Nationalities, Finance, Transport, Agriculture, Commerce, Food, State Control, Public Health, National Economy. These Commissaries are in fact the real rulers of the Empire.

The Soviets, being elected by groups of workers working together and bound to each other by a real solidarity of interest, are evidently a more perfect method of representing the workers' interests than the western territorial system of representation. Also, the delegates to a Soviet are always mandatories sent with a special message and liable to recall at any moment. Each Soviet has for its own territory not merely legislative but executive power.

This Constitution at first sight might appear calculated to represent fairly well the collective will of the working-people, but many of its provisions reduce its representative character to a pretence. In the first place, only those men or women who are engaged in "socially useful work" have a vote at all. Completely disfranchised by law are all who hire labour (even a single clerk or servant, or odd-jobman), all who have private incomes from any source, and of course priests, monks and nuns. This

disqualification might be thought of little consequence seeing that all citizens from 18 to 50 years of age are liable for compulsory labour; but in practice the disqualification is taken as applying to those who *before the Revolution* belonged to any of these categories. Moreover, each Soviet has the power of deciding who, even among those otherwise not disqualified, is to be allowed to vote at the next election. As the Communist Party got hold of most of the town Soviets at the time of the *coup d'état*, and at present hold all the executive posts, they have complete control of the voting register. Voting is invariably open so that the ruling Party knows exactly on whom to exercise their multitudinous means of persuasion and pressure. They have a monopoly of the printing-press and of the public halls where meetings could be held; they have at their disposal the whole police [1] and secret service; and, most efficacious of all, they control the distribution of the food-tickets.[2]

With regard to the rural Soviets no conceivable methods can secure Bolshevik majorities, there being hardly any Bolsheviks among the peasants. They are therefore left to function as village-councils of limited powers. In the Central Congress the proportion of delegates representing country Soviets to those representing the urban ones is kept down by the provision that country delegates represent 125,000 souls while

---

[1] It appears that practically everyone at one time or another commits the crime of "speculation," *i.e.*, of buying for cash food from the country. By this he renders himself liable to arrest. The actual arrests for such crimes are only effected sporadically, and (it is averred) generally for political purposes.

[2] Food-distribution is managed through the Co-operative Societies. These had grown rapidly after 1906, and by 1917 had a membership of 10,000,000. They were made part of the State machinery after the November revolution, and nearly all their organisers were dismissed as politically unreliable. Their whole character is completely transformed, and they are now merely agencies for the distribution of food, clothes, etc. Every citizen must belong to his local co-op. The food-portions distributed (under the regulation of the local Soviet) are graduated in quantity, soldiers and Soviet employees getting the larger ones. Special food is given for special work. The ordinary portion is as yet very insufficient. Control of those Co-operatives evidently carries with it considerable power of compulsion.

town representatives speak for only 25,000. Country delegates, too, are on various pretexts frequently refused permits to travel, and refractory Soviets are sometimes even suppressed.

Such in its broadest outlines is the highly centralised machinery with which the Communist Party is striving to establish order, industry and human conditions of life among the Russian people. Never did men set themselves to so gigantic a task, or work with a more frantic energy.

Much success has already crowned their efforts.

They have crushed the armies sent or subsidised by the Western Empires. Indeed Koltchak, Denikin, Yudenitch and Wrangel, by their brutal excesses, have helped to rally all Russians around the Soviet Government. Russians are more likely to be grateful to Lenin and his Party for clearing the country of foreign and hireling armies than to remember that it was the Bolsheviks who brought these attacks on their country.

Secondly, they have restored civil order (for instance the streets of Moscow and Petrograd are safe at all times of day and night) and are gradually producing some measure of that material well-being which is a prerequisite to any form of civilised society. Trotsky and Lenin would not be at pains to deny that the scramble and starvation after the November Revolution was in great measure their own doing, for that Revolution was a far more thorough churning up of the elements of society than had been the preceding one.

If, true to their doctrine, they unhesitatingly cast Russia into chaos they now are showing no less faith and devotion in building up their New Jerusalem from the ruins of the old order.

The main problem before them is, of course, the food-problem. Food exists in sufficient quantity in the country; the difficulty is to get it to the towns. As a result of the Great War, and the Civil Wars following it, the railway system is in utter disorganisation and ruin. Like all

other employees, the railway men were hopelessly demoralised by the removal of authority in November, 1917. In the districts around the towns, where train-transport was unnecessary, the food difficulty was just as acute. Previously the peasants had been in the habit of supplying the towns with food and of buying with the money they got the salt, clothes, tools, machines, manures which they needed. After the two revolutions, especially the second, they could get none of these things, and therefore would not give up their food-stuffs. Forcible requisitions only made things worse. Industrial products alone could entice food into the towns. Yet town industry had also collapsed. The sudden establishment of workmen's control in the factories caused immediate slackening, often cessation of work. Many of the workers by way of protest, others by way of celebrating the new order, took to smashing the machines and were naturally urged on by their foremen or ex-employers. Thousands made off to the country to be sure of food; thousands were, as the Soviets gradually got power, sent off to the country, not being politically reliable; other thousands were drafted off to the Red Armies. Moreover, factories which might have made articles useful for exchange had to be devoted to war-munitions. Industry was hampered too by want of coal (the Donatz basin being cut off by Koltchak) and oil (Baku being cut off) and iron (Ukrainia having broken away). Russia had relied almost entirely on foreign import for machines and even for simple tools such as axes and saws, which could not now be replaced or mended; and to crown all, workers were weak for want of food. The blockade of course intensified this difficult position; but even had there been no blockade, foreign merchants would not have accepted Russian credit.

This destruction of the mutual relations of town and country still persists in great measure, so that it is clear that, though Russia is a preponderantly agricultural

country, the first care of her rulers must be the restoration of town industry. All the more imperatively necessary is this as Russia must henceforth be rendered much more self-sufficing than she was before the war. The Bolsheviks are making hasty use of the present prospect of free trade with foreign countries, for they are quite alive to the precarious nature of any arrangement made with Capitalist Governments. The Soviet Government realises that if (as it hopes) these governments undergo revolution they will be for a long time too weak to supply any goods, while if they remain capitalist they will always view with suspicion and hatred the Socialist Empire.

For the rehabilitation of industry evidently the very first condition necessary is the repair of the transport system. Russia has now only a fifth of the engines and wagons which she had in 1914 when her railways were a joke for foreign travellers. Before the war she had only one loco-works. Of the locomotives which survive most are "sick." Krassin, a former railway manager, is Commissary of Transport, and has perhaps the hardest task of all the Commissaries. Hundreds of factories have been overhauled and fitted out for the repair of engines; indeed, any factory at all suitable for the work is granted extraordinary facilities for fuel and its own special requisities on condition of its undertaking to repair a certain number of engines and wagons per year. "Saturdayings" (*i.e.*, the devoting of Saturdays and Sundays to voluntary unpaid work for public purposes, organised by enthusiastic Bolsheviks everywhere all over Russia) have been largely devoted to this pressing purpose. Already great improvements have been noted. In December, 1919, the engines repaired numbered 475; in the following June they were 1,161; but many of these repairs consist in the transfer of bits of "dead" engines into "sick" ones. For the restoration of her transport system more than for anything else Russia depends (as regards immediate relief) on foreign help.

This she is getting from many countries; for instance in February of this year Krassin placed an order with a Tyneside firm for the repair of many thousands of engines to be shipped to England at the rate of 20 a week.

The provision of fuel too is a matter of great urgency. In Russia winter is long and severe, and until coal and oil are forthcoming in abundance locomotives and factories are being largely fed with wood. Great efforts have been made. At first the Soviets took charge of the work, and Saturdayings were organised for it. Afterwards bigger schemes were set on foot. At the end of 1919 the 3rd Army, its military duties being over, was organised as "the first Revolutionary Labour Army" and was devoted mostly to the preparation of wood-fuel and its carriage from the forests to the towns. Still more extensive efforts were made when in June, 1920, the system of compulsory State labour was enforced all over Russia.

At the 9th Congress of the Communist Party a very grandiose plan, called "the Economic Plan," for the systematising and perfecting of all industry in Russia was approved of, and steps were taken to put it into operation. It comprises nothing less than the electrification of all Russia. Around Petrograd, Moscow, Novgorod and all the big towns huge power stations worked by oil, coal, water or peat are being erected; some are already in working order. All private power-stations are forced to unite their cables to central State cables, so that there may be unity and ease of control in the distributing of power to the various factories. Gigantic plans are being discussed for utilising the peat-bogs and the rivers for the electrification of agriculture.

All the large industries, coal, iron, gold and platinum mines, the petroleum wells, the locomotive works, most metal industries, railway works, shipping, salt, cement and others, 50 in all, are nationalised, each of the fifty orming a special department under the Commissariat

of National Economy. The factories of a particular department, say the metallurgic factories, are divided into a number of "trusts," the managers of each trust performing much the same function as the directors of a capitalist company. Russian factories are not very numerous, about 10,000, 6,000 of which are small and left in private hands though "controlled." The other 4,000 (the Labour Party Report says 5,000), including some very large ones, are nationalised—that is, worked directly by the departments above mentioned. It is quite impossible to state what success has up to the present attended this Economic Plan, but apparently good progress is being made. In January, 1920, Rykoff, Commissary of National Economy, stated that only 2,000 of the 4,000 nationalised factories were working; the English Labour Party's Report of July, 1920, appears to give (the figures are not very conclusive) a much bigger number.

As to the immediate management of the factories Bolshevik methods have changed much since the Revolution. At first the workers in each of them managed it themselves by means of a committee of control. This proved disastrous; indeed in some cases the workmen themselves begged the former owner to resume his place. After many tentative plans the 9th Congress of the Communist Party decreed one-man control. Volumes of course were written to prove that this is compatible with the purest Socialist theory. Each factory is now under the supreme control of one man aided by an advisory body of experts. Some enthusiastic Bolsheviks even glorify the Taylorisation introduced in many places! If voluntary workers are not sufficient, the local Compulsory Labour Committee supplies conscripted labour; if this cannot be had in sufficient amount in the locality, the Central Labour Council drafts it from other places. Discipline is Spartan. Avoiding registration, going off to the country, injury to

tools or materials, negligence in work are all offences punished with imprisonment or, in case of refractoriness, with incorporation into "Corrective Battalions." The authorities "stand no nonsense." Freedom of labour is declared by Lenin to be "a Bourgeois notion." Strikes are of course a serious offence. They are declared to be "illogical," as "one cannot reasonably strike against oneself."

At the same time, in order to utilise the working power of the peasants, "labour armies" are being used—that is, the armies when their work at the front is over are (after the skilled mechanics have been picked out and drafted off to where they are most wanted) set at works of public utility such as bridge-building, road-making, fuel-gathering, etc. This, however, is only a temporary expedient. A labour census of the whole country is being prepared, and it is intended that the militia system will provide not merely a military force ready at all times to defend "the political front" but also a labour army to fight wherever wanted on "the economic front."

From this rapid survey one can get some idea of the vast resources of energy which the Bolsheviks have at their disposal and are using for the establishing of Russia in prosperity and power.

It must not, however, be imagined that their highest ideal is the keeping of their citizens in (as the detestable capitalistic phrase has it) "a state of physical efficiency." They look eagerly forward to the time when the present frantic struggle for food and raiment will be over and when the life of every citizen will be brightened and ennobled by the higher joys of mind and spirit; nor have they, even during the present stress, been sparing in their efforts to encourage art, literature and music. Theatres, cinema-halls, music-academies, art-schools have all been nationalised and made easily available. A gigantic scheme is even now in progress for the introducing of the masterpieces of the world's literature to every

Russian home. Hundreds of scholars have been set to work at translations which are to be printed by the State and distributed broadcast over all the land. The choice of books is bizarre, often even harmful; the whole scheme is crude and likely to be futile; but it shows at least some nobility of ideal in the minds of its originators.

One of the chief pre-occupations of the new rulers is, needless to say, the education of the Russian people, the overwhelming majority of whom are at present quite illiterate. In theory all children receive up to the age of 16 primary education (and school-meals), the more talented of them secondary and university education as well. Enormous sums of money are being allocated to the training of teachers and the establishing of schools in town and country, the bourgeois school buildings being of course utilised for this purpose. Many institutions adapted from foreign models, such as crêches and kindergartens for children under school age, and summer-colonies for the others, have been highly praised by visitors and are said by the Bolshevik authorities to be available for some 2,000,000 children. On the whole, however, little can be noted yet but tendencies. The English Labour Commission estimated that between 15 per cent. and 20 per cent. of the children are receiving some form of schooling, while another very sympathetic witness came to the conclusion that child education is less diffused—in the towns at least—than under the old regime. There is a regrettable tendency to send even very young children to boarding-schools separating them from their mothers. Possibly this may be due to the fact that women as well as men are being conscripted for labour, in which case perhaps this inhuman tendency will be less marked when the present industrial stress will have been relieved. The Bolshevik mentality, however, which subordinates the integrity of the family to the interests of the State, does not encourage one to hope for such an improvement.

Towards religion the Bolshevik attitude is most lamentable, though no worse than that of the Mensheviks, the writers of both parties professing philosophic materialism and showing a bitter hostility to revealed religion. Lenin in the usual Socialistic manner speaks of religion as the opium used by the Bourgeois for stupefying the people. Naturally, too, the Jewish element in the Russian Socialistic movement is hostile to Christianity.[1] On the other hand to attack openly the faith of "pious Russia" would be too dangerous. By law all citizens enjoy "liberty of religious and anti-religious propaganda." Religion is therefore free, but no very definite and reliable information has yet reached us as to how far this freedom is a reality. We know hardly anything about the matter except that the churches are often crowded and that *ikons* are to be seen in most houses. Religion is not allowed to be taught in the schools—presumably, too, anti-religious teaching is also forbidden in them. As to what actually happens there is evidently much reason for anxiety. One of the obligatory school subjects is the Theory and Practice of Communism. It is at least probable that the teachers, whose interest it is to stand well with the authorities, do not confine themselves to the purely economic side of this subject, especially as the books written by its exponents are bitterly anti-religious. We know, too, that in many rural districts parents refuse to send their children to the new "atheistic" schools.

Is the Soviet Empire firmly established? If it is, it must inevitably some day come into conflict with the Capitalistic Empires of Western Europe and with the United States, and the world will be consumed in a conflagration compared to which the Great War was but a hearth-fire.

Two things alone are certain. First, that attacks of

[1] In this connection it is interesting to note the great prominence given to Talmudic and Mediaeval Jewish literature in the great literary scheme referred to above.

the inefficient kind alone possible at present will strengthen the Bolshevik rule, and, secondly, that as long as the present state of stress and misery lasts in Russia the Bolsheviks are secure. They have set up a machinery of sorts and are working it vigorously to establish conditions of civilised life. Till these conditions are established, none of their enemies, Socialist or *ci-devant*, will interfere with them.

As to whether they will conquer the dangers with which their very success in re-establishing material comfort is bound to confront them no man can hazard an opinion.

The gravest of these dangers will probably come from the peasants, 85 per cent. of the whole population. For years past this peasant problem has divided the progressive political thinkers of Russia into two parties—the Social Revolutionaries (formerly called the Peasants' Party or The People's Party) and the Social Democrats or Marxists. The former looked forward to the overthrow of Absolutism as an opportunity of seizing the lands of the Crown, Church, and nobles, with a view to handing them over to the peasant-Communes. Each Commune would work its newly acquired lands co-operatively, but independently of the Central State authority. Private property of small holdings was not objected to, but hired labour was to be forbidden. The spirit of co-operation, already highly developed by the *mír*, was to be fostered as the chief hope of all agricultural Russia. Opposed to this policy was that of the Social Democrats, who, however, on the land question as well as on the urban question were divided into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. The latter, rigidly Marxist, held that just as in the towns Socialism could only come about as an evolution from capitalistic conditions (concentration of wealth, large-scale enterprise, growth of proletariat, etc.) so, too, in the country, peasant proprietorship should first give way to large-scale agriculture managed

by capitalists with hired labour. In the event of a revolution they intended therefore to nationalise all lands, even that of the peasants; they would then try to establish the national agriculture on a large-scale basis by means of a centralised system of authorities, or, if this were not feasible, they had no theoretic difficulty about letting out vast tracts of land to companies or even to individuals. Thus would the countryside be proletariarised and gradually prepared for socialisation. The difference between this theory and that of the Bolsheviks was that the Bolsheviks considered that under certain conditions such as obtained in Russia the intermediate capitalistic stage could be jumped over. They recognised, however, that as regards the peasantry there was no possibility of this "jump." The peasants wanted land and land as their own. What the Bolsheviks did finally was to decree on paper the nationalisation of all land, even peasants' land, but in practice to allow peasant ownership. The peasants were told to go and seize all the big estates and divide them (by means of the Soviets) among themselves. Thus has the Bolshevik Government secured the support of the peasants, who now have more land than before, hold it as their own, not troubling about the absence of titles, and transmit it, spite of all Bolshevik theory, to their children. Lenin hopes to lead them gradually to Socialism by education, propaganda,[1] and by the establishment among them of model Communistic institutions. For instance, many large "Soviet Farms" belonging to the State and worked by peasants organised and paid like factory-hands have been established; also "Communal Farms," on which a number of peasants

[1] A remarkable feature in modern Russian life is the Propaganda train, painted all over with Socialist pictures, mottoes, etc. It is fitted up with wireless apparatus and printing presses, and distributes newspapers with the proper official views and carefully chosen news, it also brings about cinema films to illustrate the glories of Bolshevism; dramatic companies, singers, lecturers, etc., travel on it spreading the New Gospel.

and their families are gathered, working together and eating at a common table; also "Artels," groups consisting of all or part of the inhabitants of a village who merge their little holdings in a single estate worked collectively. To encourage such forms of association the Government grants favourable conditions for sick and aged insurance, and especially gives them preference in the distribution of seeds, manures, up-to-date machines, etc. Information is not yet available as to the effects of all these institutions. One would expect them to develop a strong co-operative sense rather than that very different thing, a Socialistic sense.

Hitherto the *moujiks* have remained content with the Soviet Government, all the more content as vast numbers of them found the Whites under Koltchak and Denikin much more oppressive. Still they have their grievances which may yet prove very dangerous. They are bound to deliver up (after providing for their family requirements) certain quantities of their food-stuffs [1] to the State at fixed low prices to be paid in the form of goods, textiles, manures, salt, tools, etc. The surplus (which, in Central Russia at least, is generally very small) they can dispose of at will, selling it in the nearest market-town (this, however, is against the law) or selling it to the State Co-operatives. As the State finds it hard enough to provide the goods which are to be exchanged against the peasants' obligatory tribute, it has nothing to offer them for their surplus stocks except paper-money, which they will not accept. In consequence there has been a great falling-off in agricultural production. The recent 10th Communist Congress seems to have decided on legalising what is called "speculation,"

[1] Up to quite recently (April, 1921) all their surplus corn and fixed quantities of other products had to be given up. At the 10th Congress of the Communist Party it was decided that they were to give up one-tenth of all their products (all other tributes and taxes being remitted). It is not very clear how this meets the difficulty of the case.

i.e., the selling of food for cash to private individuals. If this be legalised, agriculture will improve; but on the other hand private property, not merely in land but in everything else, will be more firmly entrenched than ever among the peasants.

As we have seen, the Constitution is much more favourable to the towns than to the country, and the Government has striven to thwart any peasant movement by sowing dissensions among them, dividing them for voting purposes into "rich peasants," nicknamed "village vultures" (who are disfranchised) and "poor peasants." On the other hand, the State-given education, Bolshevik as it is, can hardly fail to strengthen the position of the country as against the town. It is hard to conceive an educated peasant proprietary standing patiently the dictatorship of the town proletariat.

Even if the peasant difficulty can be conjured away it remains doubtful whether the town population, when the present abnormal stress has passed, will remain content. One thing is quite certain. The pleasant hope of a change in the nature of the people, a change from Bourgeoisic self-seeking to Communistic altruism, will prove delusive. Original Sin will not be legislated or educated out of existence, and therefore the Dictatorship of the Communists will not (as Marx and Engels foretell) "wither away." They will remain in power or they will be cast out. Moreover, power is sweet, and its fruits are attractive and easily reached. Though the Bolsheviks are now in their first fervour, are marvellously self-devoted, true to each other, and energetic, it is sheer nonsense to imagine that their spirit will not grow cool, and they they will be always able to resist the temptations to which their position inevitably exposes them. Yet, if they degenerate they are doomed, for they will then appear for what they really are, a new Bourgeois caste, and they will have to fight for their power against heavier odds than capitalist Bourgeois need ever expect to face.

Critics—even Socialist critics as Kautsky—are fond of insisting that the Bolshevist system is, as regards its methods and its effects, pretty much like the capitalist system of which it professes to be the antithesis. And in truth the capitalistic caste system which is rapidly developing in many countries has many resemblances with the present government of Russia. In both centralisation is pushed to the extreme; in both education and the press are forced into the service of the State; in both wire-pulling and "wangling" are the highest state-craft; in both the solidarity of the family is impaired—in the one case subordinated to State interests, in the other often crushed by industrialism; in both law looks less to justice than to the interests of the ruling power; in both the highest and greatest things of human life, the things of the immortal soul, are ruled out as of no account. Yet between the two systems there are big differences—some in favour of the capitalist system, others in favour of the Russian; among the latter is this that the Bolsheviks, however their theory works out in its effects on their subjects, really do aim at high things for all the men and women in the land, and that they themselves lead for the most part hard and unselfish lives.

All the sadder is their failure; for every Christian, however sympathetic he may feel to much in the aims and efforts of the Bolskeviks, must see that their great experiment was doomed to be and has proved to be a hopeless failure as a form of human society, as hopeless a failure as is capitalism itself. Yet if their failure is complete, it has at least something splendid about it; it is not all compound of sordidness and vice. The immediate cause of the vitiation of both capitalism and Bolshevism is the same, violence done to human liberty—violence done in the one case through mistaken zeal for a godless theory, in the other through unredeemed selfishness. Men under the Communist rule will probably feel

their slavery the bitterer because it has been imposed on them suddenly and with violence; men in the servile states now rapidly forming will feel their chains light and be well content to work for their masters in return for good food and raiment. Yet their state will be the sorrier; for they will be slaves (and therefore vicious) not merely in the externals of life but in spirit.

Both Bolsheviks and the rulers of the modern capitalistic States are using the same means to enslave their subjects—namely, the destruction of the institution of private property, which in the one case is being taken from the multitude to be given to the few, in the other taken from all to be given (in theory at least) to none. Society can never be established in peace until its framers pay due regard to the instincts which God has planted in men's hearts and to the rights which He has given each individual human being. Every man has been given the right, not merely to have sufficient food and clothing, but to own that amount of the goods of the earth which will enable him to lead without excessive difficulty a full and proper human existence. Only when the institution of private property has been made firm and universal will men cease to be treated as "units" or "votes" to be manipulated and juggled with, and only then will "Democracy" and "the popular will" come to have any real meaning.

L. McKenna.

TWO ULSTER PATRIOTS.

BY JAMES WINDER GOOD.

DR. WILLIAM DRENNAN is still remembered as the poet of the United Irishmen. The title, though Drennan would not have quarrelled with it, is not strictly accurate. It is true that the passion which burns with such sombre intensity in "The Wake of William Orr" ranks that poem, not only as the finest written by a contemporary, but as amongst the finest of all the verse inspired by the movement which claims Orr as its first martyr. Yet Drennan was less the poet of the United Irishmen than a poet who helped to make the United Irishmen a reality. He can scarcely be described as the "onlie begetter" of the movement because the idea was germinating in the minds of many of his associates. But he was the first to outline a practical scheme, and his enthusiasm did much to overcome apathy and rally recruits to the cause.

Drennan was also, though this is not generally known, a vivid prose chronicler of events and a singularly penetrating and candid critic of the men and movements of his time. If the world is ignorant of this, the world, I hasten to add, is not to blame, for the simple reason that the letters in which Drennan recorded his impressions, comments, and opinions are still unprinted. After his death his papers were packed into an old box where they lay for many years. Mrs. Adam Duffin of Dunowen, Belfast, a descendant of the poet, in whose possession the letters now are, has devoted herself with

patient care to sorting and arranging the mass of manuscript. It would not be easy to exaggerate the difficulties of the task. Drennan's correspondence, mainly with his sister, Mrs. McTier, runs to more than a thousand letters, ranging over a period which covers the whole term of Grattan's Parliament, the struggle for Reform culminating in the '98 rising, the passing of the Union, and the years of reaction that followed the triumph of Pitt and Castlereagh. These letters were huddled together without sequence or coherence, and, since many of them lacked either date or post-mark, the task of fitting them into chronological order was exceptionally difficult. Mrs. Duffin's industry and insight triumphed over all obstacles, and she has completed her labours as editor by appending to the letters a valuable series of biographical and explanatory notes.

It is imperative that the correspondence should be published. Apart from their value as a footnote to history the letters reveal Irish life as well as Irish politics from a new angle. Drennan and his sister are artists, not mere annalists; and it was their good fortune to live in a period and move in circles that enabled them to do more than chronicle small beer. Their letters may not possess the headlong vivacity and the romantic thrills of Wolfe Tone's inimitable "Journals." They are indeed to Tone's records much as the novels of Richardson to those of Fielding, with the clatter of tea-cups more in evidence than the clink of claret glasses and the gossip of quiet folk in middle-class parlours substituted for moving adventures by flood and field.

Drennan was a remarkable man, and his sister Matty shows herself in these letters a still more remarkable woman. Belfast has advanced by leaps and bounds since she went up and down its streets, criticised its celebrities and politicians, dissected the sermons of its preachers, and cracked jokes or played whist in its drawing-rooms. The little town she knew and loved has

expanded into a great city, but I question if its teeming thousands can show many women of her mental stature. Not indeed that other places are entitled to throw stones at Belfast on this score. Mrs. McTier's shrewd wit, her admirable judgment, her passionate loyalty to great ideals, and the skill with which she analyses the thoughts of others and records her own are gifts that would have won her distinction in any community. She lived all her days in Belfast, and as Drennan practised as a physician in Dublin from 1789 till his retirement in 1807, the correspondence between them covers the progress of events throughout the most dramatic period of the eighteenth century in what were then the two great centres of revolutionary opinion in Ireland.

Drennan came to Dublin a strong enthusiast for Catholic Emancipation and Parliamentary Reform. Naturally, he exalted Grattan, and his thumb-nail sketch of "the little man so genteely ugly," marching to the hustings in company with Lord Henry Fitzgerald in May, 1790, has more bite and expressiveness than a score of conventional portraits.

> I have just seen Grattan and Fitzgerald proceeding to the hustings at the head of more than 1,400 men, 18 of the Corporation, bands of music playing, etc., Grattan advancing on his light fantastic toe, hope elevating and joy brightening his crest, his eye rolling with that fine enthusiasm without which it is impossible to be a great man. Some distance behind walks Napper Tandy in all the surliness of republicanism, grinning most ghastly smiles, and as he lifts his hat from his head the many-headed monster raises a shout that reverberates through every corner of the Castle. . . . Let me take another glimpse at Grattan. When all that mighty multitude shall be dead and forgotten as if they had never been, that little man there with the triangular phiz, so genteely ugly, so full of soul —his name shall live as a redeemer of Ireland.

Later he writes after a visit to the House of Commons :—

> My chief entertainment was observing Grattan ; for, excepting him, Ponsonby, and (I think) J. Corry, I could have made as good

a speech as any I heard from either side. Grattan is without exception the most singular speaker that ever, with such a figure, voice and manner, made an oration. His voice was totally lost at every third or fourth sentence, and his action was violent to a degree of fury which is felt because it is genuine enthusiasm, and he makes the other speakers who are young men throw about their arms and struggle in their throat in order to seem energetic and give some sincerity to their declamation.

Drennan was not long a spectator at the pageant of Dublin political life. His means were limited, largely because his absorption in other affairs did not tend to increase his practice as a physician. In 1796 we find him bemoaning the fact that he had made only fifteen guineas in four months, and he writes as if an income of £300, which he never realised from his profession, meant positive affluence. Fortunately in Dublin in the last decade of the eighteenth century there was, on the side of the Reform party at least, no snobbery either of birth or wealth. Drennan was soon on terms of intimacy with political leaders, reforming peers, popular preachers, and all the glittering stars who scintillated in the Four Courts or blazed in fierce debates in the Parliament in College Green. He tells his sister of dining *en famille* with Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Pamela.

> They were both very civil, and I think the latter a very interesting little woman ; and Nature, it is said, never shows herself greater than in little things. . . . They have a fine ruddy-faced republican boy, and our dinner was in the same stile, a nice Turkey, nice salmon, and Potatoes which were from a farm of his own, and so far of noble extraction.

This was decidedly a more comfortable meal than Drennan enjoyed when he was invited to take pot-luck with John Philpot Curran. "We dined," he says regretfully, "in the study, in the midst of dirt and confusion. Bad servants or rather none, good meat ill-dressed, good wine, though not even a screw in the house—all at sixes and sevens." But if Curran failed as a host he triumphed as an entertainer, and Drennan describes

him as "a marmozet of genius." When Drennan had guests at his table, the fact that his purse was badly lined did not lead him to stint the fare. This is his idea of his supper at a quiet dance: "Two quarters of lamb, breast of veal, 12 chickens (large), Ham, Tongue, Crabs, Blamange, Cheese, cakes, custards, lemon cream, Tartlets, almonds, raisins, oranges, figs, and French plums." Pinched moderns who can still taste the flavour of war-bread and margarine will learn with envy that this supper was given in the thick of the European struggle with Napoleon.

Drennan, as I have said, came to Dublin an admirer of Grattan, and that admiration persisted. Though conspicuously and essentially a moderate, he was a moderate who wanted to better Grattan's pace. His musings on this subject led him early in 1791 to sketch the outline of an organisation which was to all intents and purposes that of the United Irishmen.

> I should much desire that a society were instituted in this city having much of the secresy and somewhat of the ceremonial of Free-Masonry. . . . A benevolent conspiracy—A Plot for the People—No Whig Club—no party Title—The Brotherhood its name—the right of Man and the greatest happiness of the greatest numbers its End. Its general end Real Independence of Ireland, and republicanism its particular purpose. Its business, every means to accomplish these ends as the prejudices and bigotry of the Land we live in would permit. . . .
>
> The means are manifold—publication, always coming from one of the Brotherhood, and no other designation. Declaration—a solemn and religious Compact to be signed by every member, and its chief and leading principles to be conveyed into a symbol worn by every one of them round their body next the heart.
>
> Communication with leading men in France, in England, and in America, so as to cement the scattered and shifting sand of republicanism into a body . . . and when thus cemented to sink it like a casoon in the dark and troubled waters, a stable, unseen power.

"You are not, I believe, a republican," he says to Sam McTier, his brother-in-law, to whom the letter is

addressed, "but not many years will elapse till this persuasion will prevail, for nothing else but the public happiness as an end, the public will as the power and means of obtaining it is good in Politics, and all else is job."

The seed sown by Dr. Drennan fell on fruitful ground. Within a few weeks the Society of United Irishmen took definite shape, and Drennan was appointed to draft the Test. In the Society he naturally came into close contact with Wolfe Tone. The two men, however, had little in common, and from the first they seem to have pulled strongly in different directions. Tone opposed Drennan's Test as "too rhetorical and too argumentative," and Drennan, very strangely, got it into his head that Tone of all people was inclined to subordinate the wider issue of combining all sections into unity to the special business of acting as the champion of purely Catholic interests and claims.

Drennan was also the author of the famous Address to the Volunteers which some years later formed the subject of a State prosecution. Even before his trial and acquittal Drennan no longer felt happy in the United Irish movement. He was, as I have said, a moderate in grain, and the swing to the left of the Society, which naturally followed the speeding-up of the Government's policy of repression, did not meet with his approval. Drennan's doubts and difficulties as set forth in these letters give a tragic picture of the plight of a moderate man in a revolutionary epoch. His judgments on the merits of various issues as they arose were nearly always sane and sound. But the detachment which enabled him to take a view unclouded by passion had its weak side in a lack of driving-force. He did not possess the power to impose his views on others, especially in face of strong opposition, and the fierce controversies which are meat and drink to the born politician harrowed his sensitive soul. Even at the height of his enthusiasm for the movement he was sadly perturbed by the taunts

and libels of its enemies. "Here there is such denunciation and abuse of us and our Society," he writes in 1793, "that it is hard to bear; publicly called and stigmatised as men without all religion, without all principle; and for the first time it makes me melancholy as the end must be to alienate everyone from me and make me an exile in the midst of society."

On more than one occasion his sister takes him roundly to task. Here is an outspoken letter in answer to his complaints of ill-treatment.

> I hate croakers and, above all, affected ones. You panted for fame. You got it. You were read, praised, admired, prosecuted, cleared, and abused. What would you have more? Could you suppose that in this career you would not make enemies, that you would not be painted in dirty colours? Even here I think you have escaped wonderfully, and I would rather suppose you were nettled that your abilities have not drawn forth some more dignified switching than silly paragraphs in a newspaper.

But Drennan's croaking was not, as this letter might suggest, a matter of hurt vanity. At the worst it was a temperamental defect. And it is important to note that, though he disliked alienation from his fellows, he never abandoned his convictions or modified his expression of them either to placate his enemies or to please his friends. He stood firmly to the end by the original Test of the United Irishmen and the Address to the Volunteers. His complaint was that the Test was superseded by "ties of a stronger and coarser stuff" which sought to commit him to methods of which he disapproved.

In 1796 we find him writing:—

> I have always, as a man of candour and simplicity, hated and detested the idea of a plot and conspiracy of which a *people* should never have occasion. Everything I wrote I published, and I have always kept out of the way of those who acted in a complotting manner, not with a view of conniving, but telling them, as some well know, my nature and inclination was against any such methods.

The weakness of his position was that he had no real

hope that the policy he advocated would save the situation. In the same year, 1796, he utters this confession of despair.

Some time ago I thought there might be some sort of union effected between the political parties, and I was going to write privately to Mr. Grattan on the subject, but I dropt that intention and several others of a similar kind from a conviction of their inefficiency. Administration would just as soon concede a republican form of government as a reform in the present government; and there is no real distinction of parties *now*, whatever name they may take, than the English and Irish Interests. How is it possible to reconcile them? The English mode of Uniting is known by the experience of centuries. The Irish mode of Uniting is by separating, and a nation of blunderers can do no better.

Drennan's prophecy of a drift "from what may be called Civil Anarchy to Civil War" was tragically fulfilled. The first blow fell on Belfast, and Mrs. McTier's breathless letter describing Lake's swoop on the Northern leaders sounds a note only too familiar to Irish readers to-day.

Since 10 o'clock this morning Belfast has been under military government; a troop of horse is before my door, a guard on Haslet's, which is near us, one at Church Lane, the Long Bridge, and every avenue to the town. Haslet is taken; Neilson and Russell have been walking the streets till about an hour ago when, the Library having been broken up and a search being made for them, they delivered themselves up. . . . They are taken up for high treason. I hope there will be no irons. Neilson will be easily killed, though he looks bluff. Russell I feel for as if a younger, rasher Brother, tho' during years of intimacy I never heard a worse sentiment than his Book contained, and to those he has been consistent.

Dublin was soon exposed to a similar visitation. In Drennan's words: "You hear no other conversation in this city than of Defenders, of plots, of discoveries, of arrests, of executions. It has to me the smell of a great jail. I am often accosted with 'Are you here yet?' which is one of the sentences that would make a man wish to stay and has that effect on me." But Belfast was the

real martial law area, and Mrs McTier in a letter written on St. Patrick's Day, 1797, analyses with insight and passion the feelings of the community over whom General Lake was driving his iron harrow.

Every day produces something which a few years ago would have created amazement. . . . Murders and assassinations are dreadful subjects, but common here, and the natural consequence of what I often witness—men torn from their friends and Country, and put on board a tender without trial or anyone here at least knowing for what. The higher officers are well liked and do not seem to relish the searching business, in which some of the Church magistrates go beyond them. The country people treat the Officers well, ask them to breakfast, etc., and give them old rusty guns. Several good ones are sent in since General Lake's proclamation, and I believe many found hid in ditches.

I have one which . . . shall never, if I can help it, be raised against the people. It was bought and used for a far different purpose. Like an Idiot I registered it, at a time when fools bluster'd and ten pound frightened me. If they come for it I will not falsify, but they shall never get Sam McTier's gun. I was right when I told you half-way business would not do in Belfast. . . .

Whatever you may think of Belfast in Dublin, people here are flocking to it from the country ; even Government Country Squires. Where can they go without money ? Londonderry, it is said, is going to sneak into Newton after being guarded by soldiers all the Winter at Mt. Stewart. His Father seldom bolted his windows. Not a penny of rent is paid him. . . .

You seem to think I ought to fly. Why, I have not one fear. 'Tis only the Rich are alarmed, or the guilty. I am neither. . . .

Tho' one would think the power of the Proclamation sufficient for any purpose in a Town where I can walk from one end to the other without a servant, at nine o'clock, yet I have reason to believe other strong measures are hatching, and will be enforced whenever the Town goes out of the peace. . . . Indeed a stranger entering the Town wou'd be struck by the sounds of innocence, for the children are eternally crying " ba-ee, ma-ee " after every yeoman, while the Mothers run after them crying, if they do not behave themselves, they will be put on board the Fleet.

From this on the tragedy deepens in both towns. The correspondence in the months preceding the Rising of '98 is concerned rather with domestic than public

affairs. Mrs. McTier discovered that her letters were being opened in the post, and she revenges herself with a series of very effective thrusts at the postmaster who did Lake's dirty work. But she realised, and made her brother realise, the necessity of discretion. We know, as the price of grimmer experiences than Drennan was called upon to endure, that life even in revolutionary eras moves for the most part in the old ruts. Thus in announcing that "domiciliary visits are to be paid by night as well as day," Drennan adds: "No apparent alteration takes place, and the play-house, the Promenade, etc., take place as usual." London actors and actresses, however, "were fearful of venturing into Ireland as too real a stage of Terror and Pity." Curfew was not enforced in Dublin, but those who ventured abroad did so at their own risk. "There are military patrols," Drennan informs his sister, "that go about the streets, and it is said in the Castle knots that this City has become the Headquarters of Treason. Did they meet me at night I could safely say that I was not Cinna the conspirator but the Poet, though they might treat me to a touch of the bayonet for my bad verses."

The most objectionable part of the military occupation was the practice of billeting soldiers in private houses. On one occasion Drennan, having protested against a demand for lodgings by two soldiers, had a squabble with the notorious magistrate, Swan, who "began to abuse me, not very like a magistrate, calling me rebel, traitor, that my life was indulged to me by the Government, that he would go and send 50 soldiers to the house." Mrs. McTier had the gift of taking things philosophically. "My mother," she tells her brother, "had four soldiers for two or three nights. She, like you, argues the affair, and never mends the matter. My Pride always prevents anything but compliance, and I am never ill-treated. I cannot bear intercourse with these sort of gentry. Those who do their

duty do right. Those who go beyond are only gratified by your complaints." Incidentally, Mrs. McTier gives us a flashlight picture of life in Belfast during those June days that witnessed the failure of the Rebellion in Down and Antrim.

Sunday afternoon eight soldiers, a woman and child were sent to me, and by Major Fox on horse-back desired to make their quarters good. I opened the door myself, and they immediately rushed into the parlour. I told them and the Sergeant my situation. He pressed me to bed them, which I offered to do if he insisted on it, but that I and my family must leave the house. He behaved well the instant they were well treated. I gave them good Ale, though they pray'd for water, being just off their march from Newton, where they had been fighting all day. I pitied them much. Two were wounded. They took a shilling apiece, and we parted with civility on all sides.

The suppression of the Rising was followed by the scheme to suppress the Parliament and establish the Union, which Drennan, as far back as 1792, had divined, was the real object of Castle policy. "The report of an Union," he remarks caustically a couple of months after the Rebellion, "will not have any immediate effect on the price of houses, tho' I think it will reduce a good deal the value of men in this country." But Drennan had by this time become, politically at least, a hopeless pessimist. He scoffs, and perhaps he was justified in scoffing, at a meeting of protest in the Exchange of about 1,000 of different parties——"Orangemen, opposition men, democrats, Catholics, and Presbyterians, the omnium gatherum of the day, forced by fear into a short cordiality." "The whole business," he adds, "was rather melancholy, perhaps adapted to the time, and might have been accompany'd with the Dead March and the muffled drum." But remembering Drennan's own refusal to adopt heroic remedies—a refusal for which I admit he advanced excellent reasons—this outburst at the crisis of the Union agitation is not worthy of him.

Strange, I like my Country; I dislike my countrymen. They certainly are men, for they beget children, but they are not Country-

men. They are party men, placemen, shop-men, liverymen—any men but Countrymen. And all the rout in Dublin proceeds from the low valuation of the rent of their shops and houses. Dare the People of Ireland, even like the People of Scotland whose Covenant was their country, dare they make a Solemn League and Covenant, and swear with their hands uplifted to the Most High God (as the Covenanters did) that they will maintain their country. No, they dare not. They are halting between two opinions, and Pitt takes the advantage of it.

Thousands of Irishmen, who had dared as much as the Scottish Covenanters "to maintain their country," were in prison or exile, and thousands more were mouldering in unmarked graves on the battle-fields of Antrim, Down, and Wexford. Drennan was right in his contempt for the men who were murmuring against the Union after they had placed Pitt and Castlereagh in a position that enabled them to accomplish their purpose. He was wrong in confounding these time-servers and self-seekers with the Irish people. His sister rose to nobler heights. In a letter congratulating Drennan on the birth of his son, written shortly before the Union Bill became law, she breathes an aspiration for her countrymen in words as memorable as any uttered by the greatest of national leaders :—

I know that your son, if he lives, must see better times ; but I wish him educated in them no worse than his Father. Oh ! till that time let Irishmen remain sulky, grave, prudent, and watchful, not subdued into tame servility, poverty and contempt, not satisfied till time blunts their chains and feelings, but ardent to seize the possible moment of national revenge, never to lose hope of it till obtained, and then in proud and glorious safety—scorn it.

What I have written may give the impression that the correspondence is little more than a running commentary on political happenings. Such a view would be wholly false. Keen as was the interest of Drennan and his sister in political affairs, they had time for a multiplicity of other things as well. They took books as seriously as they took statesmen, and their comments

on them are more acute than those of the vast majority of contemporary critics. Unlike Macaulay, Mrs. McTier did not fall into the error of regarding Boswell as a fool who had written a masterpiece by accident. "What a fascinating book is Boswell's *Life of Johnson*," she cries ecstatically after devouring the volumes straight from the press, "and how improved is the present stile of biography." Her brother's enthusiasm rivalled her own. "It is," he replies, "the first work of the kind since the days of Plutarch." Gibbon, Rousseau, Volney, Tom Paine, Godwin, Mary Wolstonecraft, even Crébillon, found their way into Mrs. McTier's hands, and were submitted by her to shrewd and searching criticism. Her brother invariably sent his productions to her, and she never allowed her pride in him to blunt the edge of her comments. Drennan himself, though always pestered by money troubles, steadily refused to publish anything by subscription. "This," he writes, "is the mere Mendicancy of Literature, and tho' often done by the honourable author craft of London we in Ireland are not in the habit."

Mrs. McTier was anything but the conventional blue-stocking, though she could easily have held her own with the best of the blue-stockings of her day. As the recipes which stud her letters after Drennan's marriage show, she was a notable house-wife, and she can descend from high politics to give her brother hints like this: "You do not wear your fine cravats in the right way; to show them to advantage they ought not to be folded in plasters, but put round the neck as you would tie a pocket handkerchief in a wisp." Nor was she in any sense a prig. She relished cards as well as books and politics, and Drennan at one time seems to have feared that she was inclined to play for too high stakes, a common failing of the period from which Presbyterian Belfast was not free. "This will be a gambling winter in Belfast," she writes in one of her letters. "Guineas and notes fly about

the card tables even among young girls. At the last coterie 'tis said General Goldie lost 130 guineas." Her reply to her brother's mild remonstrances is deliciously human.

> While I stuck to 6d. whist I was night after night push'd into a corner from which there was no escape with a particular set of silly, scolding, virulent, chiming old women. I determined to escape this bondage. I play Casino, unless I get to a gentleman's set, where I play shilling and half-crown in the rubber. It interests me. I am politely treated, not stunn'd with talk. I play as well as any of them, and when I lose too much will quit it.

Again, unlike the majority of her contemporaries, she did not hold the view that what was good for her must necessarily be bad for those who filled a lower position in the social scale. Drennan was in principle a convinced democrat; in practice he always has doubts of what he calls somewhere "the timid staring people." Mrs. McTier has a more robust faith, largely because "the people" were not to her an abstraction but men and women like herself. At a time when the Hannah Mores and their kind were attempting to tame the masses with soothing moral tracts, Mrs. McTier plumped boldly for real education and knowledge of public affairs. As far back as 1795 she writes:—"So much have I gained by newspapers, and so ardently have I seen them sought for and enjoyed by the lower orders, that I intend to institute for their good a gratis newsroom with fire and candles, a scheme which you may laugh at, but if followed in country towns might have a wonderful effect." This was in its essence much more revolutionary doctrine than the gospel preached by the majority of the professed revolutionists of the period.

More than a century before any one had divined the possibilities of this weapon, the closing of the Belfast shops and warehouses on the day the Earl of Fitzwilliam left Dublin after his dismissal as Lord Lieutenant led

Mrs. McTier to foreshadow the possibilities of a general strike as a political instrument.

> Were this to be the case all over the kingdom it would be a curious situation. Would not the People find themselves easily and freely got up in a Mass ? Might not important matter start into their heads, and rush into their hands ? Might not they waive ceremony with Lord Moyra, and take it into their head to protect the country themselves and save him that trouble ? . . . Might not the Capitol, the Castle, be surprised ? But this, I suppose, is all the fears of a weak woman.

Had there been more "weak women" of the type of Mrs. McTier Irish history would probably have been more cheerful reading. I am conscious that what I have written does scant justice to Drennan and his sister, and indicates very inadequately the richness of the banquet which this correspondence provides both for the student of history and the student of human nature. But even these samples, looted almost at random, may do something to whet the appetite of readers and stimulate a demand for the publication in permanent form of these memorable letters.

J. W. Good.

THE CALL.

(After Emile Blémont).

OUR soul in Song is set a-swinging,
A cradle by the mother stirred—
But thought in dream awakens, winging
Like a spirit or a bird :

It floats, it flies, with angels vying,
Bringing to our attuned desires
Echoes of ecstasies undying
And harmonies of heavenly lyres.

George Noble Plunkett.

NEBULA.

MIDNIGHT and space, where whirling planets mark
With scincillating gleam the sundering dark;
And out on dim horizons, far discerned,
As if the sky with some strange dawning burned,
A trail of shining star-dust, showering forth
From some old huge destruction towards re-birth;
Riven and shattered, down the ages hurled,
Till, in a new serenity up-curled,
The flaming heart re-constitutes a world.

For, homeward set, the wandering atoms flee
To one clear point of swelling density,
Till, slowly drawn to ultimate control,
In it are stilled the forces of the whole.
The vapours part; the tempests disappear;
The skies are richer by another sphere.

O starry specks, devoid of form or rest,
O motes that glow and tremble in the West,
Each glimmering his little hour in vain,
Trailed down the dark, flaring to fade again,
Not yours the might, not yours, alas, the hour,
Love as ye would, for unity of power!

But now, behold, the heart, the soul of flame
Rounds to the orb your weary longings claim;
Scattered and void, the brilliance of the past
Flows to the nucleus, wins to form at last.

O leader true, who from the broken gleams
Mouldest the day-star of a people's dreams,
Drawing the atoms of the shoreless night
Into one splendour of unswerving might,
By thy high force of faith-enkindling fire
Building one will for thy so vast desire,
What if the red winds bellow still their hate?
Thy work abides, the fiercest storms abate.
What gale can change the new-swung planet's course,
Or sway the spirit from its spirit-source?
Heart of a nation! Man of Destiny!
Thine orbit set, thy star swings wide and free.

LOLA STEELE-NICHOLSON.

SUNRISE.

I WATCHED the dawn-star dying in a sky
Of clear pure emerald. A white mist lay
On the long low meadows like forgotten spray
Drifted from ghostly seas, and all the high
Dark-visaged poplars felt a wind go by.
Then sprang the sun up, scarlet. Snatched away
My spirit rose and touched transcendent Day,
Yea to the very fount of Life drew nigh.

Since Beauty's self hath neither form nor face,
Nor Wisdom any word to greet the wise,
I have no memory of Love's voice, Love's eyes,
Or the magnificence of that haught place
That knows not length nor breadth nor height nor space,
Yet for mosaic hath the patterened skies.

ELLA YOUNG.

TO A SNOWDROP.

SNOWDROP, be not over-bold !
Trust not Sun ; his eye is cold.
Round about I see thee peeping
While thy sister flowers are sleeping—
Thy white sisters from the skies
(Was't to kiss them thou didst rise ?)—
Laughing like a sinless child
'Mid men sad because defiled.
Back upon thy grassy bed
Lay that little waxen head !
Clouds look angry ; boughs show bare ;
There's keen mischief in the air ;
Robin's trill is wildly cast
On the pinions of the blast.
Ah, sweet floweret, were I cloud,
In soft folds I'd thee enshroud ;
Were I tree, thy bloom I'd shelter
From the winter's wrack and welter ;
Were I tempest, I would hush me
To a whisper as I'd brush thee.
But, sure, He who sent thee to us
With thy frail white charms to woo us,
Flower sprung of heaven or earth,
He will nurse who gave thee birth.

Angels ! cover with your wings
Children, snowdrops, all white things.

JOHN CARR.

UNPUBLISHED IRISH POEMS.

XIV.—A priceless gift.

EDITED BY PROFESSOR OSBORN BERGIN, PH.D.

Little is known about Brian O Corcrán, author of the following poem, apparently addressed to a patron who had sent him a pair of spectacles. Other poems of his are addressed to Cú Chonnacht Maguire, who joined the Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell in their Flight, and in one poem he laments the death of Cú Chonnacht in Italy. This took place at Genoa on the 12th of August, 1608. Brian O Corcrán was probably the author of *Eachtra Mhacaoimh an Iolair*, a romance adapted from the French, which has been attributed without sufficient reason to his namesake the vicar of Cleenish in Loch Erne, who died in 1487. But as our author was a protégé of the Maguires we may assume that he belonged to the same district and family as the earlier Brian O Corcrán.

The poem is found in the Book of the O'Conor Don. I have used O'Curry's transcript in 3.C.12 (R.I.A.), in which all contractions are extended and the spelling modernized. Where O'Curry needs correction I give his readings, apart from matters of accent and aspiration. Probably §9 should precede §8.

Brian O Corcrán cct.

1. Mo chion dot bhronnadh, a Bhriain,
a mhic na flatha a finnChliaigh,[1]
a aistrigh an toirbheirt truim,
h'aisgidh badh oirdheirc aguinn.

2. Ní chuala go bhfuair ollamh
meadh don aisgidh fhuaramar;
dot ghruaidh ttaidhleach [2] téid a mheas
tar mhéid ainbhreath na n-éigeas.

3. Cearc Bhoirche fhréimhe Rosa,
fhuair clú d'fhine Fhearghosa,
gér chúis iomráidh a hainm sin,
ní gairm ionráidh mar aisgidh.

4. O Mhaoil Sheachluinn eacht oile
d'ardollamh fhóid Ughoine,
nírbh iongnadh, tarla ar a thoil,
fionnbhrugh Banbha ré bliadhoin.

[1] -chliaidh. [2] ttaighleach.

5. Nír chosmhail a chur a suim
sínead cinn[1] do Choin Chuluinn,
d'fhior tuaighe táinic tar sál,
ó ráinic uaidhe iomshlán.

6. Eochaidh éachtach na n-arm nglan,
ní thug acht éanshúil d'ollamh,
giodh toirbheartus do thuair teann,
lé bhfuair oirdhearcus Eireann.

7. Do dhearlaic sibhsi, asé a shuim,
tré bheith 'na n-amhghar oruinn,
do dhá ghoirmdhearc dhamhsa am dhall,
almsa bhus oirdhearc agam.

8. Do-bhéaradh, a bharr na mionn,
dámadh leis aoibhnios Eirionn
ar son a radhairc, rún grinn,
dhúnn, 's a thabhairt fá thuairim.

9. Gi-bé do bhronn a dhá rosg,
fá chrodh ní cóir a theagosg,
barr gleannach dá ttarla ar ttol,
eallach Banbha do bhronnfadh.

10. A ttugsat cách, beag a bhrígh,
d'Aithirne is d'Eochaidh Eigsín,[2]
ar mheas lóigh na ngormrosg nglan
an dornasg[3] óir níorbh iongnadh.

11. Ní thuigim nach feart féile
fuarus uait gan aimhréidhe,
do radharc, a thaobh mar thuinn,
's an[4] t-amharc mar aon aguinn.

[1] a chinn. [2] eigsi [3] dórdnasg [4] 'sa.

12. Gá ttám ris, ní rádh bréige,
go bráth, a mhic Mairgréige,
biad [1] mar mhalairt, más lór lat,
do lógh bhur n-amhairc agat.

13. Go n-íoca Dia red dhreich ndil
bronnadh lé léighim litir
is ré [2] sgríobhuim seal mar so
is [3] mo chean d'fhíorroinn m'anmo.

Mo.

[1] biadh. [2] 'sré. [3] *om.*

Translation.

1. Hail to thy bounty, O Brian, thou son of the chief from fair Cliu,[1] thou traveller of rich munificence, thy gift will be famous with me.
2. I have not heard that any poet got the match of the gift I have got; its credit goes to thy shining cheek despite all the wrong judgments of scholars.
3. The hen of Boirche[2] of the stock of Ros, that won fame for the race of Fergus, though her name was a theme of renown, is no notable claim as a gift.
4. At another time it was no marvel, that Maol Seachlainn should give Banbha's fair castle for a year to the chief poet of Ughoine's land [3] to do with it what he pleased.
5. It were unreasonable to point to Cú Chulainn stretching out his head to the man with the axe who came over the sea, when he had escaped from him safe and sound.[4]
6. Valorous Eochaidh [5] of the shining arms gave only one eye to an ollav, though that was a gift that boded hardship, whereby he won fame throughout Erin.
7. To sum up, because I was in sore need of them, thou hast bestowed thy two blue eyes upon me, in my blindness,—a largess that will be glorious to me.
8. Were all Erin's pleasure his, O crowned head! he would give it to me for his sight, a sure resolve, if I brought it to him.
9. Whoever has given away his two eyes, it is not right to instruct him in the matter of wealth—curly head on which my love is set—he would give away the cattle of Banbha!
10. What others gave to Aithirne and Eochaidh Eigeas [6] is of small account, compared to the price of the bright blue eyes the golden bracelet was not surprising.
11. I feel that I have got from thee, without dispute, a miracle of generosity. I have thy sight, O form like the wave! and (my own) vision at once.
12. In short, O son of Margaret—'tis no false saying—thou shalt have me for ever, if that contents thee, in exchange for thy sight.
13. May God reward thy dear face for the gift by which I can read a letter and write like this in turn! Hail to him who is the very half of my soul!

Osborn Bergin.

[1] Part of the present Co. Limerick.

[2] There are obscure references to Boirche's hen in the Dindshenchas. The poets had brought it from the west; Fothad slept three fortnights at its clucking: Revue Celtique xv. 462 and xvi. 39.

[3] An allusion to the story of Erard Mac Coisse. Annals of Clonmacnoise p. 161: "king Moylesheaghlyn of his great bounty and favour to learning and learned men bestowed the revenewes of the Crown of Ireland for one yeare upon m'Cossye."

[4] An allusion to the 'Bargain of the Strong Man' in Bricriu's Feast. A hideous giant allows any Ulster champion to behead him, on condition that he is to behead the champion the following night. All Cú Chulainn's rivals shirk their tryst.

[5] King of Connacht, of whom Aithirne (infra § 10) demanded his one eye: Rev. Celt. viii. 48.

[6] Another name of Dallán Forgaill, chief poet of Ireland in the time of Colum Cille.

BLOOD PRODIGIES.

BY HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

II.[1]

WHEN we read of statues bleeding or a crucifix bleeding we are at once confronted by the question: Whose blood is it? Blood, if it be real blood and not merely red paint, is not a substance like water or petroleum which exists free in nature. Neither is it a product which is stored in receptacles, like wine, or olive oil, or ink. It must always be somebody's blood. If we say that it is Christ's blood or that of Mary His Mother, we are postulating a particularly stupendous miracle, which in any case exposes a very sacred thing to the danger of profanation. If we say that it is the blood of the human instrument whom God uses to manifest His power, the divine Omnipotence in that event seems to be co-operating in a certain deception and to be tempting simple folk to the commission of an act which is materially and objectively idolatrous. For this reason it would surely require very convincing evidence, or at least a very clear realization of some supernatural purpose to be achieved, before one could readily lend credence to such prodigies as those which are alleged to have taken place at Templemore in the autumn of last year.

But before we are in a position to classify these events and assign them their proper place in the history of mystical experiences, it may be profitable to show by a few more illustrations how inevitably the imagination

[1] For Part I. see March issue.

of the fraudulent or mentally unbalanced visionary seems to be attracted by the type of phenomenon we are here considering. Nothing is better established by evidence than the reality of the stigmata, those wound-marks of the Crucified, with which some of His holiest servants have been favoured. Since the days of St. Francis of Assisi there have probably been between sixty and a hundred cases of complete stigmatization attested by quite reliable evidence. On the other hand I am inclined to believe that the instances of imposture or delusion in this matter are even more numerous. The former class, *i.e.*, the genuine stigmata, though carefully concealed by those who are thus favoured, are commonly made known through some accident, and if they stand the test of ecclesiastical inquiry they are bruited abroad among the faithful and the memory of them is perpetuated. The latter, the spurious phenomena, though they may cause a local sensation for a little time, nearly always fall under suspicion before long, and then the whole incident is treated as a scandal which no one, except perhaps occasionally an embittered controversialist, has any particular interest in keeping alive.

Of course there are a few famous cases of counterfeit sanctity, like those of the two Spanish nuns, Magdalena de la Cruz and Maria de la Visitacion, in the 16th century, which are familiar to all students of history. On each of those two occasions the whole peninsula was roused to intense enthusiasm for a time by the marvels the holy ecstatica was believed to perform. Crowned heads, ecclesiastics of the highest station, and even saintly ascetics, like Luis de Grenada, paid them homage and sought their counsel. When ultimately they were arrested by the Inquisition, and, with at least the imminent danger of torture before their eyes, made an avowal in detail of their hypocrisy and imposture, we may still feel a doubt whether the wound-marks of their stigmata and the other manifestations were consciously

fraudulent from the very beginning.[1] In those days neither the judges of the Inquisition nor the accused themselves, understood anything of auto-hypnotism or of the curious delusions and contrivances of hysteria. All we know for certain is that these two pretended saints showed bleeding wounds in hands, feet, side and head, that they used these and other seemingly supernatural gifts to impose upon the credulity of the people, that they publicly made confession of their hypocrisy and after some years of rigorous penance died strangely edifying deaths.

Nevertheless for one or two impostors on this heroic scale, there were probably hundreds whose efforts to mystify were limited to a comparatively narrow sphere and were followed by swift detection and punishment. Of these no systematic record is preserved. We only come upon the traces here and there of some abortive effort of the kind, which as a rule worked no permanent mischief and was very leniently dealt with by the ecclesiastical authorities. Still these stray notices are probably representative of a pretty large class of delinquents. Thus at Autun in 1674 we may read how one Jeanne Gros did solemn penance in the cathedral porch in the presence of the bishop and all his canons. She read a confession in which she admitted that—

> the sweat of blood which I claimed to have experienced on the Good Friday of 1671 was false and pretended, that the under-linen stained with blood which I showed in public had been smeared with the blood of an animal and was a trick of my own devising, and that the stigmata which I often exhibited in my side, feet and hands, were produced with an instrument which I myself had contrived.[2]

---

[1] The confession of Magdalena de la Cruz has been printed by Campan in his *Mémoires de F. de Enzinas*, II., 462-506; and that of Maria de la Visitacion by the sixteenth century heretic and controversialist, De Valera, some of whose works were produced in England by R. Field, Shakespeare's fellow townsman, who was also the publisher of the first edition of *Venus and Adonis*. On the two hypocritical nuns see V. de la Fuente, *Historia Ecclesiastica de Espana*, 2nd edn., vol., v..p. 408.

[2] Grandelot, *Histoire de Beaune* (1772), p. 191.

In a very different quarter I have stumbled upon a note referring to an analogous case in the middle of the 18th century of which a record chances to be preserved at Pavia. The *Annali Universali di Medicina* (Vol. 123, 1847) contain an interesting account of an hysterical girl who had imposed upon the religious credulity of her neighbours by pretended sweats of blood. Moreover, in the course of the article the writer cites a document he had seen which had been issued by the Holy Office in the time of Benedict XIV. This paper describes how one Vittoria Biondi was admitted to mercy after confessing the frauds by which she had pretended to receive the stigmata, to perform marvellous fasts and to have been communicated by an angel. A raid, it appears, had been made by the authorities, and in her room a number of small hosts were found secreted which she used to contrive to put on her tongue and to show to her credulous followers as if they had been brought to her miraculously. Being thus detected, Vittoria made full confession and was admitted to penance and absolution.[1]

Another similar incident in comparatively recent times is described by Dr. Le Bec, the present director of the Bureau des Constatations at Lourdes, in a book which was only published a few months since. He tells us that some years ago a girl was living near Dieppe who was believed to be favoured with supernatural revelations and apparitions and in whom were also manifested the phenomena of the stigmata, which bled regularly every Friday night. In a side chapel of the parish church she adopted *des poses d'inspirée*, and people came to watch her in her pretended ecstasies. This had been going on for some little time, when the Cardinal de Bonnechose, then Archbishop of Rouen, appointed a committee of four medical men to enquire into the case. Dr. Le Bec, who was one of the four, tells us that on

[1] The document in question is headed "Notificazione di affettata Santità"; see *Annali Universali di Medicina*, vol. 123, pp. 541-542.

arriving on the Friday night they found the girl apparently asleep and that they remained in her room for two hours or more without anything happening. They then decided to adjourn to the next apartment and to leave the girl by herself. About four o'clock in the morning, deep sighs and inarticulate noises were heard proceeding from the bed chamber, and when the committee after an interval went to inquire into the cause, they found the girl with a line of red spots arranged like a crown across her forehead and with stains of blood marking the hands, feet, and the left side. She lay as if in ecstasy, and motionless, except that from time to time she drew a deep sigh. Dr. Le Bec then continues :—

> On examining the bloodstains with a lens it was easy to distinguish a number of tiny lines corresponding to the corrugations of the epidermis at the finger tips [in other words, finger prints]. With a piece of damp linen we rubbed off the marks and found the skin perfectly sound and without the least trace of even superficial laceration. The trickery was plain. The blood had been applied with a finger.
>
> Neither was it difficult to discover where the blood had come from. As it often the case with hysterical subjects, the girl exhibited the phenomenon of complete insensibility down the whole of one side. She was adroitly questioned, and in a few minutes' time she smilingly produced the pin with which she used to prick her leg on the side that was without feeling. In this way she obtained a few drops of blood with which she was able to counterfeit the stigmata of the Passion.[1]

It is possible that this hemianaesthesia is a factor of considerable importance in many of these cases of simulated blood prodigies, and I shall have to recur to it later on in discussing another curious manifestation, of quite recent date.

So far we have dealt only with examples of spurious stigmatization, of which it would not be difficult to com-

[1] Le Bec, *Critique et Contrôle médical des Guérisons surnaturelles*, Paris, 1920, pp. 205-206.

pile a long list,[1] and it must, of course, be admitted that these cases are different from the bleeding-statue phenomena with which we are here primarily concerned. Still the prominence of the idea of blood and the desire to excite wonder and admiration are common to the two. Moreover we occasionally find them both combined as in the famous case of Hans Jetzer and the Dominicans of Berne. On this occasion, *i.e.*, in the year 1509, four Dominican priests were burnt at the stake, after having been found guilty by the ecclesiastical courts of the blasphemous imposture with which Jetzer charged them. Pére Mortier, the historiographer of the Dominican Order, openly avows his belief that their guilt was proved. For my own part, I incline to the view of Dr. N. Paulus, G. Schuhmann, R. Steck, and many others, that the fathers were no more than the over-credulous victims of Jetzer's cunning, and his morbid craze for simulation. The essential facts are briefly these :—

In August, 1506, Hans Jetzer, a young man with an unsatisfactory previous record (he had been dabbling in necromancy, as was afterwards discovered, and had claimed to have visions) offered himself as a lay-brother novice to the Dominican community at Berne. He was taken on probation, and soon after his arrival the part of the house in which he slept began to be disturbed by manifestations which would nowadays be described as those of a poltergeist. In January, 1507, he received the habit of a lay-brother novice, but the spirit from the other world still continued to pursue him and was supposed to be a soul from purgatory of whose repulsive appearance he gave a blood-curdling description. After the 11th of March the spirit molested him no more, but before departing it announced that Jetzer would soon be favoured with celestial apparitions. These duly arrived

[1] Several names of impostors of this kind who have been prosecuted in the courts of justice are mentioned by A. Maury in his article on stigmatization in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Nov., 1, 1854, and by J. B. Meyer in his book, *Wunderschwindel*.

before the end of the month: first St. Barbara and then our Blessed Lady. The novice thereupon began to acquire a reputation for sanctity, and before long it was made known that our Lady had herself marked him with bleeding stigmata. Ecstasies followed and Jetzer in a state of apparent trance began to enact all the scenes of the Passion. A further stage was reached when to protect him from diabolical illusions a consecrated Host was brought to his room and left there with a light. Our Lady came and after venerating the Host took it into her hands, whereupon it at once turned blood red between her fingers, and in this condition it was shown afterwards to many people from outside.

All these wonderful events became the subject of excited gossip in the city of Berne, and soon it was announced that the novice had been transported by angels from his cell to the chapel of the Blessed Virgin, and that there the statue of our Lady was shedding tears of blood. One of the leading magistrates of the city was invited by the Prior to come and see for himself, and being brought to the chapel he discerned plainly enough the blood-stains, where the tears had fallen. What probably weighed most with the judges in the subsequent trial and condemnation of the four incriminated Fathers was the fact that it was given out that the Blessed Virgin had explicitly condemned the Franciscan teaching of the Immaculate Conception and had declared herself to be conceived in sin. To the dissemination of these utterances the Dominican Fathers at Berne had undoubtedly been a party.[1]

The degree of culpability of the Fathers, who were burnt at the stake, does not particularly concern us here. No one can possibly doubt that the statue's tears of blood, the empurpled Host and Jetzer's stigmatization all formed

[1] The story is told in some detail by Father Mortier, *Histoire des Maîtres Généraux O.P.*, tom. v., pp. 183-191; the original documents are all in Stock, *Die Akten des Jetzerprozesses* (1904).

part of an imposture of the grossest kind, but the brain which conceived the plan I believe to have been Jetzer's, and it is characteristic of the cunning and persistence which such hysterical subjects often display that after a very light public penance he managed to escape from custody and seems to have taken a wife. His end is unknown. With regard to the blood-red Host it is curious to note that the pseudo-mystic Eugène Vintras, who in the first half of the 19th century revolted from the Church and founded a new religion of his own, is supposed to have been the subject of similar manifestations. Vintras is now perhaps best remembered through the references made to him in Maurice Barrès' rather sinister novel *La Colline Inspirée*, but he had a certain small group of followers who apparently believed in his preternatural manifestations. A modern admirer writes of him: "He who had so constantly been refused communion by the priests, had hosts brought to him by invisible hands; these hosts were often bleeding."[1]

It is not of course always possible to pronounce quite so definitely upon the fraudulent character of alleged blood prodigies as it is in the case of Jetzer. There are in particular two sets of analogous manifestations, both connected with the province of Apulia in Southern Italy, which, while of an extremely suspicious character, do not seem ever to have been made the subject of judicial enquiry or formal condemnation. I can only speak of them here very briefly. The first is connected with that extraordinary person Palma Matarrelli d'Oria. Although in the later years of her life the stigmata in hands and feet had disappeared, or showed only rarely, her forehead still bled on occasion and also a wound in her breast. The blood falling from her forehead was caught in handkerchiefs or pieces of linen and marked them with rudely traced emblems—hearts, swords, flames, stars, right angles, etc.—patterns which seem to have deeply impressed many

[1] H. L. Grange, *Le Prophète de Tilly*, Paris, 1897, p. 21.

of the devout pilgrims who visited her. Similar representations appeared upon the linen cloths which were given her to staunch the blood which ran from the wound in the breast.[1] Unfortunately Palma gives the impression of being a very tricky person, a sort of pious counterpart of her countrywoman, Eusapia Palladino. We have regarding Palma an unofficial but very outspoken utterance of Pius IX communicated towards the end of his life to the well-known antiquary Mgr. Barbier de Montault :—

> I have had an investigation made concerning Palma [said the Pope]. In consequence of the report which was then drawn up, I have left the matter in the hands of the Holy Office, and the Holy Office has pronounced that the whole business is diabolic. The Holy Office is pledged to secrecy, but I am not pledged. Take good heed, then, of what I tell you. What Palma is doing is the work of the devil, and her pretended miraculous Communions with hosts taken from St. Peter's are a pure piece of trickery. It is all imposture, and I have the proofs there in the drawer of my bureau.[2]

The other manifestation which I would couple with this is that of the "San Bambino" of Bari. Whether any honour is still paid there to the little wax infant of which so many prodigies were once recorded, I am unable to say, but from 1866 to 1872, the marvels were apparently at their height. The wax figure, about twelve inches long, lay in a crib under a glass shade, in the keeping of two elderly ladies. We may pass over the miraculous exudations of moisture which being collected in phials worked miracles, as well as the unaccountable perfume which came from the Bambino, and its changes of position when no one was touching it. What is more to our present purpose, we are assured that the same figure many times over sweated blood so copiously that this also could be collected in phials; further that it bled

[1] See the long account in Dr. Imbert Gourbeyre's, *Les Stigmatisées*, 2nd edn., vol. ii., pp. 101-111. He gives several reproductions of these patterns.

[2] Barbier de Montault, *Œuvres Complètes*, vol. v., pp. 198-199.

from different parts of the body according to the feasts of the ecclesiastical calendar, and finally that linen cloths or pious pictures, placed under it, used regularly to be found impressed with blood-stains, forming emblematic figures. It is moreover stated that these prodigies were attested, after personal inspection and experiment, by Mgr. Pedicini, the Archbishop of Bari. I have been unable to make any serious examination of the evidence upon which all this rests. One can only say that the channel through which the information comes is far too unreliable to substantiate facts so improbable in themselves.[1] At the same time the story illustrates once again how the idea of blood is apt to dominate the morbid imagination of those who are in search of marvels.

Passing on to some other manifestations which do not quite so violently offend our sense of what is congruous and seemly, I may call attention in the first place to the case of Blessed Giacomo Bianconi, O.P., of Bevagna. His biographer states that a year before his death, which occurred in 1301, the humble Dominican fell into great despondency of mind regarding his own final perseverance, whereupon the crucifix before which he was praying spurted out blood which marked his face and hands and conveyed to him the divine assurance of God's inexhaustible mercy. Unfortunately we can hardly regard this as anything more than a graceful legend. The Life is not strictly contemporary, we have no confirmation from any independent source, and no witness was present when it happened. Thus it seems more than probable that the story was at least in part suggested by certain blood-red marks which were seen on the saint's countenance and hands at the time of his death.[2]

---

[1] The Abbé Curicque, who tells the story at length (see his *Voix Prophétiques*, 5th edn., Vol. i., pp. 41-57), refers to a booklet by Don Bruni, and to the *Rosier de Marie*.

[2] See Piergil, *Vita del B. Giacomo Bianconi*, Rome, 1729, pp. 105-108, *cf.* p. 58.

A somewhat similar doubt must be felt regarding the crucifix of the stigmatized nun Columba Schonath. We are told that to comfort and strengthen her in her sufferings our Lord by causing her crucifix to shed blood gave her a sign that it was really He who guided her. Even from the account published by her biographer it appears that she was alone and in ecstasy when this manifestation began. When she came to herself she said to the infirmarian Sister Bernard (Columba was an invalid at the time): "I dreamt that the crucifix which hangs near the stove has sweated blood. Give it to me; I want to make sure." Then Sister Bernard looked and saw fresh blood coming from the eyes and the side of the figure on the little wooden cross. Columba wiped the places with a damp cloth and the blood came off and stained the linen. In spite of the fact that the Prioress and others afterwards deposed that they saw the blood actually exuding from the crucifix,[1] this seems to me, I confess, quite unsatisfactory evidence. Columba in her trance-state might easily have kissed the figure so passionately that she caused her gums to bleed and left clear traces of the blood on the crucifix itself.

Neither am I more favourably impressed by the details which Dr. Imbert Gourbeyre has left on record concerning the *stigmatisée* of La Fraudais, Marie-Julie Jahenny. There appears to have been in the case of this girl a certain courting of publicity, a distinct anxiety that people should come to investigate her phenomena, which while very conspicuous in the mentality of so unsatisfactory a person as Palma d'Oria, is entirely wanting in St. Theresa, St. Catherine of Siena, St. Veronica Giuliani, and all the canonised Saints whose lives have been subjected to the searching criticism of the *Advocatus Diaboli*. Four different objects in the room

[1] They declared that they saw the blood "nicht nur frisch, sondern auch hervordringend und fliessend aus der Seite des Crucifixes." Heel, *Die hochbegnadigte Ordensschwester Columba* (Regensburg, 1880), p. 88.

of Marie-Julie, two pictures and two crucifixes, are alleged to have sweated blood, though not all on the same occasion. What is remarkable in this case is that, according to Marie-Julie's report of what our Saviour said to her in ecstasy, the blood which showed on the pictures, etc., was His own Precious Blood. Accordingly she honoured it and would have others honour it as she honoured the Blessed Sacrament. The Abbé Lequeux, who in 1880 was one of the friends and champions of Marie-Julie, describes how on one occasion in his presence the girl, who was confined to bed, fell into an ecstasy and cried out that the picture at the foot of her bed was bleeding. The Abbé turned to look, and saw that a spurt of blood (*un jet de sang*), about an inch long, marked the chromo-lithograph in question, which represented Christ on the cross. Then he continues :

> Whilst I was gazing at the picture, I noticed that Marie-Julie had her lips glued to her crucifix and seemed to be drinking. I then went closer to her, and I clearly saw crimson blood upon the crucifix and upon the lips of our dear victim, who, putting out her hand, said to me : " " Father, quick, give me my other crucified love, your own crucifix." I put it into her hands, and immediately she began to drink in the same way. After a few minutes she added : " My Jesus wants you to purify the two crucifixes with your consecrated fingers." I then took a piece of blessed linen and purified the two crucifixes, both of which were reddened with crimson blood Then Marie-Julie said to me : " My Jesus wishes you to purify my lips which His adorable Blood has purpled."
>
> Accordingly, holding the linen by its two ends, I pressed it upon the lips of the ecstatic girl.[1]

I must confess that the impression which all this leaves is distinctly unfavourable. Why should the girl want to " drink from " two crucifixes, one after the other, or why should our Lord inspire her to do so ? On the other hand, if we suppose that she was an hysterical *poseuse* whose bleeding gums or bitten tongue had already

[1] Imbert Gourbeyre, *La Stigmatisation* (1894), vol. ii., pp. 119-121.

produced a stain of blood on the picture, her wish to make the most of the opportunity and to gratify her friend by making his crucifix also bleed is readily intelligible. The same ill-regulated impulse to over-do things seems to have marked the Templemore manifestations. A single bleeding statue would, it seems to me, have had a better claim to serious attention than a row of pious objects all reproducing the same marvel.

These are the principal examples of blood prodigies that I have come upon in the course of a somewhat protracted quest, and without doubting that there are probably many others which have escaped my notice, it seems a fair inference to draw that this particular type of miracle is rarely, if ever, to be met with in the authentic records of the lives of canonized Saints. If, in point of fact, God does vouchsafe to manifest His power by causing blood to exude from the surface of a picture or the eyes of a statue, it seems a strange thing that the recipients or channels of these favours should so rarely be numbered among those whom the Church and all the world recognise to have been His most devoted and highly privileged friends. On the other hand, it is plain enough that tricks which are apt to wear a more or less religious complexion and which involve the sweating of blood, vomiting of blood, mystifications concerning blood stains and so on, are of common occurrence amongst hysterical and unbalanced visionaries. Let me conclude this paper by giving an account of a very recent case of this sort which I have personally had the opportunity of investigating.

The girl, let us call her Lizzie Smith, lives in a manufacturing town in the north of England and belongs to the artizan class. She is now, I should judge, about 37 years of age. She was born a Protestant, but when she was in her teens she came across some nuns and eventually was instructed by them and received into the Catholic Church. About the same time she had a fit or a paralytic

stroke which affected her whole left side. The leg gradually recovered, but the arm obstinately remained rigid; the hand was clenched and the nails even began to grow into the palm. She remained in this condition for some time until a pilgrimage to Holywell was suggested to her. She went and was there rather dramatically cured. As the latest "miraculée," she thus attracted a good deal of attention; her photograph appeared in local newspapers, and she became an object of veneration to many of the more humble pilgrims, several of whom made friends with her and invited her to stay with them in their homes. After this she began to be visited by the spirits of the dead. Some came to ask her prayers that they might obtain their release from purgatory; others—and in particular a little girl who had died just after her first Communion and whose photograph she had seen in the house of one of her new friends—came from heaven to watch over and direct her. From the guardian spirit last referred to she received warning that she would soon be favoured by an apparition of our Lady and afterwards of our Saviour Himself. When our Saviour came, she was instructed to have some pieces of clean linen ready, and also a number of little pictures and objects of piety; for our Lord, she was told, would bless them. After some postponement, the vision of our Saviour duly occurred. He showed Himself as He was in His Passion, His wounds dripping with blood. This blood (she was of course alone when the vision appeared), He allowed to drip on to the strips of linen, and He blessed the pictures by touching them with His fingers, leaving on each four drops of blood, roughly indicating the extremities of a cross. I have in my possession a number of these pictures. There is no doubt that the marks they bear are those of congealed human blood. Sometime later she professed to have received the stigmata, which were renewed from time to time on such days as Good Friday and festivals of the

Passion. The wounds were not deep, neither did anyone ever see them forming. It is practically certain that they were self-inflicted; but there *were* wounds and they bled. When I saw Lizzie Smith in the August of last year, arriving at her house without any notification of my intended visit, she showed me in the palms of her hands, slight but quite perceptible traces of a stigmatization which she averred had occurred on the previous Friday. One curious development may be mentioned here, though it has no direct connection with our present subject. In the November of 1919, the soul of a priest from purgatory, so she stated, came to her to ask for prayers. He laid his right hand upon her right arm, and the hand burnt through the blouse which she was wearing and left the impress of the thumb and fingers upon her forearm. There can be no question as to the burning of the sleeve of the blouse, or as to the marks upon her arm. Several persons, some of them quite sceptical as to the supernatural character of these manifestations (her parish priest was one of the latter number), saw the impression when it was quite fresh. They assured me that the imprint, as of four fingers and a thumb, was unmistakable.[1] I myself saw the marks, nine months after the event, though at that time they were blurred and fading. Finally on the afternoon of March 17, 1920, another manifestation occurred. She declared that the metal figure of a large crucifix, which hung beside her prie-dieu, suddenly began to sweat blood. The whole figure was dripping with blood. She covered the crucifix with a piece of clean linen and next day took it to her

[1] These marks were seen by at least two medical men and by a lady doctor, who were all very puzzled by them. It is possible that the burning of the blouse and also the marks on the arm were produced by a strong acid, but the medical opinion did not seem very positive on the point. On the other hand, if this was a case of hemi-anæsthesia there may have been little or no sensation in that arm, and both blouse and arm may have been burned with a red-hot poker. The difficulty is that at the time of her fit or stroke of paralysis, fourteen years earlier, it was the left arm which was affected. The marks, however, were on the right arm.

director, a priest in another town many miles away. There in his presbytery I saw it five months later, the linen still adhering to the figure and only detached from it with difficulty owing to the coagulation of the blood. Subsequent developments, upon the nature of which I need not enter, have (I believe) satisfied even those who formerly looked upon these various occurrences as supernatural, that the incidents of the story I have just narrated were all due either to imposture or self-delusion. Still Lizzie brought into the Catholic Church nearly all the members of her family, and every evening a crowd of humble people assembled in the room she occupied and there recited the rosary with great devotion.

The story, it seems to me, is interesting as an illustration of the extravagances of which the hysterical temperament is capable. The predominance of the blood idea is in this case especially noticeable. At Lizzie's instigation, or certainly with her sanction, a convent of hard-working nuns, among whom she passed for a hidden saint, busied themselves in cutting the blood-stained linen cloth, which our Lord was said to have blessed, into fragments and sewing them up in little covers of American cloth to be worn around the neck or given to the sick as relics. The clergy lent no encouragement to this sort of propaganda, but a little band of followers seem to have been very zealous in the cause. It will be noticed that the incident of the crucifix sweating blood occurred some months before anything was made public concerning the happenings at Templemore. Moreover, curiously enough, on that very morning (St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1920), on which the figure of Lizzie's crucifix was bathed in blood, a photograph had appeared in the *Daily Herald*, representing the miraculous flow of blood from a picture in a French village church. Of this last very puzzling phenomenon I do not here propose to speak[1]. No

[1] A friend of mine witnessed it, and though remaining sceptical, could suggest no satisfactory explanation. He was accompanied on this occasion by the well-known poet, Mr. W. B. Yeats.

adequate investigation of the occurrence has yet taken place, although the Society for Psychical Research has for some time contemplated the idea of a systematic enquiry. It may be sufficient for my present readers to state that the curé in whose church these manifestations continue to take place is not only suspended by his Bishop, but persists in saying Mass in defiance of this suspension. The photograph, however, with a brief account of the phenomenon appeared in the *Daily Herald*, and it is certainly a strange coincidence that on that very evening Lizzie Smith invited the attention of her parish clergy and others to the fact that a wonderful prodigy had occurred in her room and that the figure of her big crucifix was dripping with blood.[1]

If this paper were not already so long I should have been tempted to say a few words about the Holy Thorn of Andria. According to tradition the thorn shows traces of vivid crimson blood whenever Good Friday coincides with the Feast of the Annunciation. There is a similar thorn with an identical tradition at Bari. Both places are in Apulia. In 1910 the prodigy took place at Andria and was formally attested by many witnesses. I am informed on good authority that it has also occurred in this present year. One important point to be noted is that the traces of blood are already there, normally brown in colour. When the miracle happens, the blood, if one may so speak, revivifies. The prodigy, therefore, belongs to the same category as that of the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius. Thus there is in this case no ambiguity as to where the blood comes from.

HERBERT THURSTON.

[1] One other prodigy, that of a crucifix at Gandia in Spain which was said some few years ago to shed tears of blood, proved on investigation to be baseless—so, at least, I am credibly informed.

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE.

BY PROFESSOR ALFRED O'RAHILLY, M.A.

[*The following short paper formed the concluding section of the article published in our March issue. Exigencies of space forced us to hold it over. Professor O'Rahilly had intended to revise and enlarge it; but imprisonment at the hands of the British military authorities has made this impossible. He is at present* (*May* 16) *interned on Spike Island.—Editor.*]

IV.—Transfer or Designation?

In the older Schoolmen, such as St. Thomas, we find the view that political power is in the people, or in a ruler in so far as he represents or takes the place of the people. But later on, under the influence of the famous *lex regia* of Roman law, the unanimous phraseology is that power is transferred by the people to the ruler. There is no doubt that many of the Scholastics took this to mean that the people first had the power and then despoiled themselves by handing it over, by way of donation or contract, to the ruler.[1] Now, this is not a very satisfactory position, inasmuch as it regards popular sovereignty as chronologically, rather than ethically, prior. Nor can the institution of government be viewed as the abdication of the community; it is rather the pro-

[1] This view was originated by certain legists, e.g., Baldus: "Populus Romanus . . . denudatus est generali potestate cum illa translata fuerit in principem."—*Commentarium in* i. ii. *et* iii. *codicis libros*, ed. Lugd., 1585, fol. 75*c*. But contrast Hugolinus (*Distinctiones*, 148, 34): "Certe non transtulit sic ut non remaneret apud eum, sed constituit eum quasi procuratorem ad hoc."

cess whereby the community makes necessary provision for itself. In connection with the director or secretary of a company, a professor in a university, or the superintendent of an estate, we do not speak of a transfer of power, we use the word appointment. There does not seem any reason why we cannot similarly express the Scholastic theory by saying that the people *institute* the form of government and *appoint* the individual government or ruler.[1] It is really this communication or delegation of power which is meant by transfer, but which is, perhaps, less ambiguously expressed by appointment.

There is, however, a school of thinkers who would not only improve terminology but entirely reject the whole idea of communication of power through the people. This theory, which assimilates the concession of political power to the collation of spiritual jurisdiction, was originated by the imperialist opponents of the papacy. "God alone elects," says Dante,[2] "hence electors should not be so called; they are rather to be regarded as declarers of divine providence." This view made no headway in Catholic philosophy, but after the Reformation it was adopted, as a moderate form of the theory of divine right, by many Protestants.

Between thirty and forty years since, when I was a young student in Cambridge [writes John Goodwin, in his *Obstructors of Justice*

---

[1] "Instituere namque potestatem est ordinare quod in communitate sit aliqua potestas tanta et talis, ad tot casus, ad talem populum, et sic de similibus. Et talis institutio tempore praecedere potest communicationem certae personae."—Almain, *De auctoritate ecclesiae*, c. 2; Gerson, *Opera*, ed. 1706, ii. 980. Some modern upholders of the Scholastic theory prefer to avoid the idea of transfer. Quilliet, *De civilis potestatis origine theoria catholica*, 1893, p. 174: "ius naturaliter et divinitus populo competens elegendi ac determinandi politicum suum regimen." Billot, *De ecclesia Christi*, 1903[2], pp. 513, 515: "Non ipsa politica potestas sed solum ius determinandi legitimam regiminis formam, necnon et legitimam rationem investiturae gubernii, naturaliter in populo esse asseritur. . . . Sed haec ad penitiorem tantum doctrinae expositionem spectant, et forte lis esset magis de verbis quam de re."

[2] *De monarchia*, iii. 16; *Opere*, ed. Moore, p. 376. Cf. the view cited by Ockham, *Octo quaestiones*, q 2, c. 3 (Goldast, *Monarchia*, ii. 346f).

1649][1], such doctrines and devises as these: . . . that the interest of the people extend only to the nomination or presentation of such a person unto God, who they desire might be their king, but that the regal power, by which he is properly and formally constituted a king, is, immediately and independently in respect of any act of the people, derived unto him by God—these, I say, or such like positions as these were the known preferment-divinity of the doctorate there, and [were] as the common air, taken in and breathed out by those who lived the life of hope in the king and sought the truth in matters of religion by the light of his countenance.

That a theory with such an Imperialistic-Gallican-Protestant parentage should nowadays be expounded as the orthodox Catholic thesis, is somewhat of a shock. This particular contention is merely part of the general anti-democratic reaction to which reference has already been made. The chief argument in support of it is Pope Leo XIII's declaration [2]:—

Many more recent writers, following in the steps of those who in the last century gave themselves the title of philosophers, say that all power is from the people. . . . Catholics dissent from these men and seek the right to rule from God as its natural and necessary principle. It is important to note here that those who are to govern the State may, in certain cases, be selected by the will and judgement of the people, since Catholic doctrine is neither opposed nor repugnant thereto. *By which selection the ruler is designated, but the rights of rule are not conferred;* nor is the authority thereby constituted, but its wielder is determined. . . . As for political authority, the Church rightly teaches that it proceeds from God.

[1] § 26, pp. 28f. The pervert Archbishop De Dominis (died 1624) seems to have introduced this theory into England; it was at least an improvement on the divine right theory of Henry VIII and James I: "Non ergo qui mutat formam regiminis defert aut transfert potestatem rectivam, sed novas personarum facit vel electiones vel Deo ita disponente etiam legitimas inductiones; et tunc illis Deus dat immediate potestatem."—*De republica ecclesiastica*, ii. 919 (*Ostensio errorum P. F. Suarez*, § 6). In § 7 (p. 921) he uses the expression designation. The theory is also to be found in Maxwell, *Sacrosancta regum majestas*, ch. 12, 1686[2], pp. 190f. Baxter, *Holy Commonwealth* (1659), thesis 182, p. 190: "When the freest people choose a prince, they do not properly and efficiently give him his power as conveying it from them to him, but are only a *causa sine qua non*, and denominate or design the person that shall from God, and not from them, receive it."

[2] *Diuturnum*, 29 June, 1881: *Lettres apostoliques*, i. 142. In Denzinger, *Enchiridion* (with context mutilated), nn. 1855-6. There are similar passages in other Encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius X.

Now the very context, even as partially cited here, shows that the Pope is simply arguing against the anti-Christian theory which rejects the natural and divine law and makes the people the absolute creator of right and wrong.

In this passage [says Cardinal Billot[1]] there is really expounded the pure and simple teaching of the faith against hostile and novel views. . . . It is denied then that by the people's choice the rights of government are conferred, that is, in the sense of those opponents of Catholic doctrine who say that the right of government itself comes altogether from the people, and not merely according to its contingent and variable forms or the contingent and variable titles to its possession. It is also denied that authority is constituted by the people's choice. This again is against those who consider civil society as born of men's free consent and attribute the same origin to authority. . . . In one word, what is denied is what has always been denied with unanimous consent by Catholic theologians.

We are not dependent even on the clear interpretation of Cardinal Billot and a score of other eminent writers (including opponents of the Scholastic theory such as Vermeersch). For Pius X in his letter on the Sillon cites this very passage of Pope Leo as "a refutation of the

[1] *De ecclesia Christi*, 1903[2], pp. 515f. Similarly Hugonin, *Du droit ancien et du droit nouveau*, 1887, p. 6; Costa-Rossetti, *Phil. moralis*, 1886[2], pp. 328,630; Castelein, *Inst. phil. moralis*, 1899, p. 483; Quilliet, *De civilis potestatis origine theoria*, 1893, pp. 349-355; Moulart, *L'église et l'état*, 1895, pp. 87ff; Vermeersch, *Quaestiones de iustitia*, 1904[4], § 559, p. 704; Macksey, *De ethica naturali*, 1914, pp. 550ff; Ireland, *The Church and Modern Society*, 1897[2], pp. 16f; Féret, *Le pouvoir civil devant l'enseignement catholique*, 1888, p. 177; Hickey, *Summula* 3 (1919[4]), 501; Cavallera, *Bulletin de litt. eccles.* (Toulouse), March, 1912, p. 112; Sortais, *Les catholiques en face de la démocratie*, 1914, pp. 199-240; Genelli, *Rivista di Fil. Neoscol.* 10 (1918) 119; Choupin, *Valeur des décisions doctrindes et disciplinaires du Saint-Siège*, 1913[2], p. 358; Ryan, *Catholic Doctrine on the Right of Self-Government*, 1919, p. 12; Vallet, *Praelect. phil.*, 1890[6], ii. 438; Marcellus a Puero Iesu, *Phil. moralis et socialis*, 1913, pp.718f. B.Gaudeau, *La fausse démocratie et le droit naturel*, 1911, p.55; T.Pègues O.P., *Revue thomiste* 19(1911) 607; L. Watt, S.J., *Irish Eccles. Record*, August, 1917, p. 97; P. Finlay, S.J., *Irish Catholic*, 19 Feb., 1921; L. Izaga S.J., *Estudios de Deusto*, 10 (1918) 344f; E.Masterson, S.J., *Irish Theol. Quarterly*, April, 1921, p. 121. According to these twenty-four writers —and doubtless there are more—the Pope is simply combating atheistic individualism and makes no animadversion whatever on the Scholastic theory, which remains a perfectly tenable view supported by great authorities and strong arguments.

attempt to reconcile Catholic teaching with the error of philosophism."[1] That Bellarmine and Suarez could be referred to as moderns following in the footsteps of [the 18th century] "philosophers" is chronologically impossible, that the teaching of such great apologists should be characterized as "the error of philosophism" would be an utterly preposterous contention. But it passes all limits of our credulity and tolerance to be informed dogmatically, without reference to the score of authoritative writers who have emphatically repudiated the groundless suggestion, that a mere *obiter dictum* of a long papal letter, which is entirely devoted to upholding basic Christian principles, is to be construed as the official condemnation of a thesis which received the adhesion not only of Bellarmine and Suarez but of practically every Catholic philosopher and moral theologian for over five centuries; and this in favour of a view which was originally devised against the Papacy and has merely somersaulted into some recent Catholic books. "It is quite unfair and unscientific," says Dr. J. A. Ryan,[2] "to read into two isolated sentences a condemnation of a doctrine which was taught by the great majority of Catholic moralists and jurists for upwards of seven centuries. Therefore it cannot be seriously maintained that the traditional doctrine has been superseded by the official authority of the Church." This alleged extraction

---

[1] *Acta Ap. Sedis* 2 (1910) 616. The reply of a Roman Cardinal to the Abbé Féret (reference in previous note) is worth citing in full: [Leo XIII] animo intendens non ad innocuas catholicae gentis opiniones sed ad pestiferas novatorum doctrinas, qui, inter terram caelum quodvis vinculum abrumpere pertentantes, civilis potestatis originem non a Deo sed ab hominum consilio emanare effutiunt, iure meritoque clamat: Potestas a Deo est. Hinc ipse dum profunde ac copiose suum edisserit argumentum, ea duo vocabula, *immediate*, *mediate*, silentio praeterit; quo sane incedendi modo ibi ecclesiae non filios sed perduelles corripi, hosque tantum ad meliora consilia amplectenda excitari liquido constat. . . . Evidenter eruitur sedem apostolicam haud torvis oculis conspecturam illorum librorum novas editiones, in quibus civilis potestatis origo mediate a Deo vindicatur. Et re quidem vera, cum ex Leonis XIII oraculo haec opinio nullam iacturam perpessa sit, eccur ipsa in damnatorun errorum censum enumeranda erit?

[2] *Catholic Doctrine on the Right of Self-Government*, 1919, p. 12.

of a concealed definition displays ignorance of those scientific rules of interpretation which, in the interest of justice and tolerance, should always be applied to such ecclesiastical documents, which, unless they contain formal mention and explicit reference, may not be presumed to intervene in controverted questions of the School.[1]

This whole attempt to drag papal pronouncements into the midst of a philosophical discussion among Catholics is singularly irrelevant. As Cardinal Billot points out, the Pope is combating the atheistic individualism which was popularized by Rousseau and his successors. Here, as elsewhere, the Pope is engaged in

---

[1] Many, if not most, writers since 1881 (*e.g.* MacEvilly, *Expos. of the Ep. of S. Paul*, 1898[5], i. 115) continue to regard the Scholastic theory as a perfectly free and very probable opinion, without referring at all to Pope Leo's Encyclicals. From 1911 to his death in 1919 Fr. Macksey, S.J., taught the Scholastic theory in the Gregorian University under the very shadow of the Vatican; his book *De ethica naturali*, published in Rome in 1914, contains an able exposition of the theory and a detailed interpretation of the Encyclicals of Leo XIII. and Pius X. I have been able to discover only two writers of repute who find a real discrepancy between the Scholastic theory and the Encyclicals: Archbishop Healy, who considered it "impossible to reconcile" Suarez with Leo XIII, though he admitted that the Suarezian was still "a perfectly free opinion" (*Irish Eccles. Record*, Dec. 1881, pp. 708, 704); and Père Schwalm O.P. who (in his *Leçons de phil. sociale*, 1912[2], ii. 478) not only "extracts" from S. Thomas the designation-theory invented by later Gallicans and Protestants but considers that Leo XIII has made it "the Catholic thesis." (The absurdity of this is evidenced by the fact that only a small minority of Catholic writers uphold the theory of *designation* by the *people*). Cf. also Tepe, *Inst. theol. moralis*, 1898, i. 339; and note of editor in Zigliara, *Summa*, 1912[15], iii. 271. Most of those who misinterpret the Pope (*e.g.*, Schiffini, Bouquillon, Blanc, Farges and Barbedette) content themselves with saying that he seems to favour the idea of designation. Thus Vareilles-Sommières (pp. 379f): The Scholastic theory "does not seem to be exactly adapted to the indications given incidentally by Leo XIII. . . . But it would be going too far to say that this opinion is not conformed to the teachings of the Holy See." The *Leçons de philosophie sociale* of Père Schwalm (†1908) were published posthumously from his lecture-notes and never received his final revision. But in his later article on Democracy in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie* (tome 4, pp. 271-321) he makes no mention whatever of the designation-theory and states clearly (p. 304) that the encyclical *Diuturnum* was directed merely against Rousseau.

With reference to the teaching in the Gregorian University, I have before me copies of the highly laudatory letters sent to the Rector (P. Luigi Caterini, S.J.), together with three gold medals, by the Cardinal Secretary of State on behalf of Pius X., on 19 May, 1914, 30 Nov., 1915, 11 Nov., 1916.

refuting and condemning the sovereignty of the people solely and exclusively and formally in the sense in which this sovereignty denies the supremacy of God.[1] Every Catholic, whether he admits that power is transmitted mediately or immediately, must hold that political power comes from God, and is not simply a congeries of individual contributions over which the people have absolute control irrespective of moral principles. The Scholastic doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, so far from denying, actually presupposes the sovereignty of God.

If, then, both the Scholastics and their modern Catholic opponents admit the divine origin of civil power, are their differences so vitally important? Does it make any practical difference whether we speak of designation or transfer? In answering this question in the negative, many writers have failed to distinguish between designation-by-facts and designation-by-the-people. Probably a majority of contemporary Catholic writers advocate a theory, or rather various theories which agree in maintaining that certain *facts* (*e.g.*, occupancy) can designate and determine a sovereign immediately, *i.e.*, quite independently of the people's consent. And it is precisely these writers who have chiefly striven to eke out their arguments by quotations from encyclicals; quite forgetful of the fact that another important school of Catholic

---

[1]Cf. *Immortale Dei* (Denzinger, n. 1868): Ortum publicae potestatis a Deo ipso, non a multitudine, repeti oportere. I have no space to deal with Pope Leo's two letters (*Au milieu des sollicitudes*, 16th Feb., 1892, and *Notre consolation*, 3rd May, 1892), whereby he sought to induce French Catholics to accept loyally the Republic. The letters are not really relevant and involve issues debated between Royalists and Republicans, which would require a whole article for adequate discussion This is Archbishop Ireland's interpretation (*The Church and Modern Society*, 1897[2], pp. 395f): "The Pope declares that whatever be the form of government in a nation it cannot be considered so definite as to be unchangeable, even if this had been the intention of those who first constituted it. And when a nation has adopted a form of government however new, such form of government is binding upon citizens; for it is the expression of the will of the people, and the interests of social order demand that it be accepted and obeyed. Empires, monarchies, republics are alike entitled to recognition and respect—the one condition for the legitimacy of any form of government being that is has been constituted by the people."

philosophers, who seek to modify rather than to oppose the Scholastic theory, also quote the Popes on *their* side. Thus Cavagnis, Schwalm, the editor of Zigliara, and others, think that Leo XIII's language favours the theory of designation, not by facts, but by the people. This serious division among the misinterpreters of the encyclicals may serve as a final *reductio ad absurdum* of this misplaced ingenuity which seeks to bury obnoxious Scholasticism beneath authoritative documents.

With the various, and often contradictory, theories of designation-by-facts we are not here concerned; they will be dealt with elsewhere. We are considering merely that modification in the Scholastic theory which consists in substituting designation-by-the-people for transfer-by-the-people. And at first sight the distinction is more metaphysical than practical. For if popular election is regarded as the *sole* medium of designation, then in practice it is tantamount to the theory of transfer or appointment.

> If it be held [says Dr. J. A. Ryan[1]] that the consent of the people is always a necessary prerequisite to the assumption of political power by any person, it is of no practical significance whether the people be conceived as handing over to the ruler authority which God has deposited with them or as designating the person upon whom God will confer the authority. In either supposition, God does not bestow authority nor does the ruler receive it, until the people have somehow given their consent.

Which is quite true, provided we add that God withdraws authority when the people validly revoke their consent.

[1] *Catholic Doctrine on the Right of Self-Government*, 1919, pp. 6f. Cf. Balmes, *El protestantismo comparado con el catolicismo*, ed. Paris, 1887, ii. 431 (note 3): Eng. trans. (*European Civilization*), note 29. Cf. *Month*, Feb. 1921, p. 161: "There is little difference in practice between being the source and being the channel of authority." The following writers hold the theory of designation-by-the-people and so admit the general Scholastic thesis of government with the consent of the governed: Bailly, Audisio, Peltier, Cavagnis, Zigliara, de Belcastel, Schwalm, "M" (author of the Saint-Sulpice *Compendium philosophiae*), Deshayes, Farges et Barbedette, Blanc. Strictly these names should, therefore, be added to those of contemporary Scholastics given on page 45 (March issue).

And if these conditions and limitations are inserted, the whole language and analysis of the designation-theory become highly artificial and unnecessarily subtle.[1]

The theory is, in fact, a particular application of a more general tendency, which for convenience may be termed moral occasionalism.[2] This is the view that moral obligation is something more than the direct result of the operation of our will or of a physical action; we merely *posit* the material conditions determining the creation or transfer of rights. Those who take this view deny what may be called secondary moral causality, that is, all direct efficient influx of secondary causes on moral obligations. The refutation of this theory is quite analogous to the disproof of physical occasionalism. It need not be here considered except to emphasize the principle, forgetfulness of which has led to many confusions, that

---

[1] Victoria (*Relectiones theologicae* iii. 8) is often incorrectly cited as holding the designation-theory. His language is certainly not clear and has been rejected by subsequent Scholastics: "Quamvis enim [rex] a republica constituatur—creat enim respublica regem—non potestatem sed propriam auctoritatem in regem transfert; nec sunt duae potestates una regia, altera communitatis." It seems clear that Victoria is merely trying to say that power in general (*potestas*) comes from God, while its concrete embodiment (*auctoritas*) comes from the people. Cf. Baldelli, *Disp. ex morali theologia*, v. 10, 6 (1637, p. 457*a*): "Si quis cum Victoria contendat potestatem regis esse a Deo, quia est illa ipsa quam Deus primo dedit communitati, . . . non est cum illo magnopere laborandum; dummodo constet quod translatio potestatis in regem et electio illius determinate in quem potestas est transferenda, sit ab ipsa communitate; et Deus non det regibus potestatem quasi primo et immediate, sed solum secundario et mediante communitate."

[2] This denial of all human causality and transient effectiveness in the moral order is strikingly apparent in some expositions of the designation-theory. Thus Fénelon: "Election, succession, just conquest, and all other means of attaining the sovereignty, are only canals through which it glides and not the fountain from whence it flows."—Ramsay, *Essay upon Civil Government*, 1722, ch. 17, p. 208. That is, in the moral order God alone is fountain, created beings are simply canals; what about the physical order—are there no fountains? "All authority comes essentially, uniquely, immediately from God. I say this, without exception of all authority, general, partial, sovereign or subordinate. I mean that at the very moment when authority begins to exist, no matter in what individual, of whatever nature it be . . . it is God which creates for him the duty and the right to govern me well and for me the right to be governed and the duty to obey."—Barruel, *Question nationale sur l'autorité et sur les droits du peuple dans le gouvernement* [1791], p. 100; cited in Féret, *Le pouvoir civil*, 1888, pp. 411f.

the immediate moral causality of the people does not in the least contradict the equally immediate moral *concursus* of God.[1] In the natural order at least, secondary causes cannot be degraded into mere conditions without causal influence or efficiency. Hence the distinction between the appointment of a governor or ruler and the designation of a priest or pope. To group all these together as examples of designation—as the moral-occasionalists do—is to neglect a clear existent distinction and to confuse diverse phenomena under a double-meaning phraseology. Hence the Schoolmen all but unanimously refused to identify transfer of political power with designation to ecclesiastical office.[2]

"Designation of a person," says Suarez,[3] is not enough, nor, if separated from donation or contract or quasi-contract, does it have the effect of conferring power; for natural reason alone does not sustain the

[1] Catalano, *De legibus*, c. 3 (*Universi iuris theologico-moralis corpus integrum*, 1728, i. 18*b*): "Accipere immediate a Deo non facit quin etiam immediate accipiat a republica; sicuti non per hoc quod immediate accipiat respublica potestatem istam a natura, non immediate etiam accipiat a Deo." F. de Castro Palao, *De legibus*, i. 22, 4 (*Opus morale*, ed. 1700, i. 147): "Respondeo omnem potestatem regiam a Deo esse immediate; sed non inde infertur in alios prius immediate non fuisse, fuit quidem immediate in ipsa communitate a qua in regem translata fuit. Sed haec prioritas non obstat quominus in rege immediate a Deo sit potestas; tum quia non est alia potestas in rege quam illa potestas quae fuit in communitate, tum quia ipsemet Deus sua speciali providentia hanc translationem seu successionem ordinavit." Cf. also Miranda, *Manuale praelatorum*, tom. 2, q. 25, a. 14, concl. 2 (1630, p. 229*a*); and Navarrus, *Relectio "Novit,"* n. 147 (*Opera*, 1602, iv. 601): "Per Deum quidem regnant reges aetatis nostrae, quia regnant per potestatem quam habent ab ipso immediate creatam sed mediate acceptam."

[2] The following, among others, reject the political designation-theory: Almain, *De suprema potestate*, q. 1, c. 16 (Goldcast, *Monarchia*, i. 623); Molina, *De iustitia* ii. 26 (1602, p. 124); Bellarmine, *Risposta alla difesa delle otto proposizioni*, *Opera*, Neap., 1859, 4 (2), 514; Navarrus, *Consiliorum sive responsorum libri quinque*, ii. 1. 3 (ed. 1602, i. 332f); Chastel, *De l'autorité et du respect qui lui est dû*, 1851, p. 196; Desorges, *De l'origine et de la nature du pouvoir*, 1869, p. 63f; Brugère, *De ecclesia Christi*, 1878², pp. 360f; Costa-Rossetti, *Phil. moralis*, 1886², pp. 622ff.; Mendive, *Ethica*, 1888, p. 329; Van der Aa, *Ethica*, 1889², pp. 192f.; R. Rodriguez de Cepeda, *Eléments de droit naturel*, 1890, p. 527; Billot, *De ecclesia Christi*, 1903², pp. 508f., 518. Also Suarez and Tanner, cited in next note; and Quilliet, Moulart, Macksey, Cavallera (p. 105), and Féret, cited in note, p. 280.

[3] *Defensio*, iii. 2, 17. Cf. Tanner, *Theol.* schol., tom. 2, disp. 5, dub. 1, n. 84 (ii. 1021*b*).

translation of power from one man to another by mere designation of the person, without the consent and efficacious will of him by whom the power is to be transferred or conferred." That is, designation *per se*, apart from the deliberate efficacious will of God in case of supernatural jurisdiction and of man in natural appointments, is insufficient and ineffective; it must be conjoined with donation, trust or contract; it must, in other words, become transfer by agreement or consent. Such transfer implies both quantitative and qualitative control, *i.e.*, authority to decide both the specification and the individuation of the power; it assumes that the entire efficacity of the act of authorisation is derived from the will and consent of the transferor or appointer; it results in a contractual or fiduciary relation between the two parties. Not a single one of these characteristics is to be found in ecclesiastical ordination or canonical designation. Hence, unless, with the Imperialist and Protestant absolutists of a former age, we wish to confound the spiritual and the temporal, we must reject as misleading and inaccurate the recently resuscitated theory that the people do not transfer power but merely designate its recipients.

Alfred O'Rahilly.

NEW GERMANY.

BY CONSTANTIN NOPPEL, S.J.

Associate Editor of *Stimmen der Zeit* (Munich).

ON November 9, 1918, a new chapter in the history of the German people was opened. The Empire was overthrown, and the Republic stepped into its place. Events, it is true, had been shaping in this direction ever since the turning point of the Great War. But November 9th will always be reckoned as a visible landmark in our history, as the birthday of a new era. To-day, more than two years since that crisis, we may ask ourselves the question : What has become of the once great and powerful Germany, the Germany of the imperial days ?

I.

Perhaps the most striking characteristic of old Germany, especially in the eyes of foreign nations, was her great military and naval strength. Of this there remain a few small vessels and 100,000 soldiers. Or, rather, the Entente Powers allow 100,000 ; but 10,000 of these are still to seek. This army is without heavy guns and without aircraft. The fortresses left in our hands are either completely or partially dismantled. Such is the military picture of present-day Germany. The few territorial units in East Prussia and Bavaria are civil guards destined for the protection of hearth and home against revolution from within and Bolshevik invasion from without. He who trembles before this disarmed, war-weary Germany resembles the murderer frightened in his sleep by the ghost of his murdered victim. It may be said without exaggeration that the bad conscience of a former enemy is itself to blame if here and there a feeling of bitterness rankles in our soul. Had the victors of November, 1918, remained faithful to Wilson's Fourteen Points, had they, above all, recognised and applied the principle of self-determination, even the ancient and deep-seated animosity between Germany and France would have been for ever buried.

The passing of Germany's military power marked also the passing of her war-lord. The German rulers were dethroned without exception ; only a few of them refused to recognise this dethronement. But the democratisation of Germany had already begun before this final act of our political drama. The government of Prince Max of Baden, which was modelled on the parliamentary system of Western Europe, heralded the introduction of democratic methods. The position of the Kaiser resembled for all intents and purposes that of the King of England. The same obtained in the several federal States. When the revolution broke out, it was only the external form of the monarchy that had to be brushed aside. Indeed, the revolution was less destructive of the monarchical idea amongst the German people than was the action of their princes, and especially of the Kaiser, who renounced their rights without a shadow of protest and withdrew over the frontier. Their action shattered the faith of the most loyal section of their people, of those who had suffered and bled in response to the battle-cry : *Mit Gott für Kaiser und Reich.* To use an expression of the late Adolf Gröber, Centre Leader and State Secretary till the revolution : " They expected the Emperor to place himself at the head of at least one company of men."

II.

After the revolution the parliamentary system was replaced by the rule of the People's Commissaries and Councils, an imitation of the Russian Soviet system. But the sound sense of the German people demanded an ordered and democratic representation, and demanded it with such insistence that those in power were forced to fix January, 1920, as the date for the elections to the National Assembly. Thanks to the women voters a purely socialist majority was barely averted. But even so the Majority Social Democrats were by far the strongest party in the new Assembly. Still this party, after riding into power on the back of " their revolution,"

opposed every further exercise of force or dictatorship. They stood firmly for the democratic principle and endeavoured to break the power of the Workers' and Soldiers' Councils. It was the "Scheidmann-Bauer" epoch. The Social Democrats, in spite of their numerical strength, had to share their power with the Catholic Centre and the middle-class Democrats, so that they were not able to realise much of their programme. This was especially the case in regard to the Constitution framed at Weimar. Though the State was defined to be non-sectarian, still a number of important Christian principles were laid down as the basis of future legislation—for instance, touching community and family life.

In the field of social legislation the burden of responsibility rather than any special regard for the other members of the Coalition held back the Social Democrats from hazardous experiments. Scheidmann and his friends were closely connected with the trade unions—were in fact numbered amongst their conspicuous leaders. As such they were pledged to the class-war, the war between labour and capital. But their ideas were chiefly conditioned by the old methods of production and industrial organisation to which they were accustomed. Consequently they were opposed to the Councils system based on the Russian model. Their idea of socialisation was little more than the substitution of the State for the private capitalist. At the same time they were conscious that any economic system is an extremely sensitive organism, and for that reason they carefully avoided all attempts at overhasty socialisation. However, under the compulsion of strikes, they had to do something. At Easter, 1919, the so-called Socialisation Law was passed. As a matter of fact this Law contained mere words. It was a skeleton bill, which defined principles and limits, but left the details of socialisation to be filled in at some future date. The socialisation of coal, so loudly demanded, was undertaken with extreme caution. The final result was merely a compulsory

syndicate—*parturiunt montes.* This official Socialism *à la* Scheidmann has actually to the present hour scarcely produced any other fruit than mere words. Whatever new or progressive ideas it has shown have been forced upon it by others.

III.

Another tendency within the ranks of the Majority Socialists was led by Rudolf Wissel, Minister of National Economy. Wissel urged the adoption of a vast scheme thought out by Möllendorf. The latter, sometime Private Secretary to the well-known writer and industrialist, Walter Rathenau,[1] had been appointed Under-Secretary in Wissel's Ministry. His scheme may be called the "plan-system" of industrial organisation. Its chief aims were: (1) the unification of production; (2) the concentration of industries in the localities most suitable for them; (3) the suppression of unremunerative concerns; (4) a careful regulation of exports and imports; (5) the assignment of orders to be controlled. The pillars of the whole system were to be self-governing bodies set up by the different industries and officially recognised by the State. A National Economic Council was to preside over all.

Towards the close of the summer of 1919 Wissel and Möllendorf were overthrown by the party friends of Wissel himself. Wissel regarded his plan-system as an attainable step on the road to Socialism. But his opponents within the Social Democratic Party accused him of blocking, not smoothing, the way to a genuine socialisation. The violent and precipitous manner in which he and Möllendorf wished to carry out their plan was doubtless a big mistake. Apart altogether from the attacks of their own colleagues, they were bound to come into collision with the pillars of the present economic system. And yet at the root of their plan lay a thoroughly

[1] [We hope to publish in the near future an article on this remarkable man.—Editor.]

sound and Christian idea; for their idea was that the common good rather than the private gain of individual capitalists should be the guiding principle in the economic life of the country. Unbridled competition, with all its selfish and shady methods, was to be replaced by a common effort after what was best for the whole community. The industrial system was to be lifted out of its atomic individualism. The guilds of the middle ages were to re-appear in a modern form as self-governing bodies. The State as Grand Manitou of the national economic life was rejected—and rejected even by the Socialist Wissel. Its functions were to be those of general supervisor, counsellor, and arbitrator.

These principles, stripped of Möllendorf's extravagant and ill-digested methods, are still guiding principles for the most widely different circles of German economic thought. Whenever the word *Gemeinwirtschaft* (a word ambiguous in itself) is employed in Germany to-day, the Wissel-Möllendorf system in some form is generally to be understood. Its evolution proceeds along the line of Industrial Councils or, to use an older expression, *auf dem Wege des berufsständischen Aufbaues der Gesellschaft.*

IV.

To this idea of reconstructing the whole economic life on new lines contributed not merely organised Socialism, the "plan-system" (whether in the Wissel or in the less bureaucratic Rathenau form), and the revival of interest in the medieval guilds, but also (though in a less orthodox manner) the most radical elements in the labour world. We have already seen that at the beginning of the 1918 Revolution the Workers' and Soldiers' Councils came into power. True to their Russian prototype, these at once endeavoured to direct the economic as well as the political life of the country. With that object in view they introduced, first of all, the Councils system (Industrial Councils) into various factories. Socialisation in the full sense of the word—

that is the complete transfer of industrial management to the workers—failed miserably, and probably without one exception. It was only later and after careful preparation that some success was won in the field of industrial co-operation, especially in the building trade. But the Industrial Councils had come to stay. Whilst the political Workers' and Soldiers' Councils lost increasingly in power, these Industrial Councils gathered strength, day by day, both inside and outside the ranks of Labour. It is true that in many, if not most localities, they were divorced from their original purpose and became centres of Left-Wing Socialism.

As such they appeared in Berlin and in the coal districts of Saxony. By riots and general strikes in Berlin and around Halle they forced the Scheidemann Government (March, 1919), not merely to pass the Socialisation Law already mentioned, but to "anchor" the Councils system in the Constitution by the introduction of a special clause. They thus secured an apparently large measure of success for their ideas. One cannot close one's eyes to the fact that the German Councils system still bears traces of its revolutionaly origin. A large number of the Industrial Councils are still in radical hands, especially in Berlin, Saxony, and the Ruhr district. To them was due the revolutionary outbreak (Spring, 1920) in the Ruhr district, which followed closely on the Kapp *coup* in Berlin.[1]

The radical action of the Communist Party had a double effect. On the one hand, it caused a wider breach

[1] The Councils also played a part in the Munich Revolution of April, 1919. The upheaval, however, in this city owed its origin rather to the political Councils and to foreign elements. Purely political Councils, such as we find in Munich, have failed to take root elsewhere in Germany. They succeeded in Munich simply because the people, accustomed to an order of things that had endured for centuries, lacked the capacity to react quickly to a new political situation. Always content to be ruled by others, they could not be expected to show swift and energetic opposition to a revolutionary government which was slowly moving towards the establishment of a Soviet Republic. The terrible days of April and May, 1919, were needed before the citizens were roused to measures of self-help. Since then Bavaria enjoys the reputation of being once more the most stable land in Germany.

and a concomitant weakening in the Socialist Parties; on the other hand, it extorted certain legislative measures which have become the starting-point for a new reconstructive policy. Thanks to Article 165 in the Constitution, democracy in new Germany is not a mere copy of Western institutions. A seed has been sown which seems destined to develop along the lines of the old guilds once indigenous amongst us. But to return to the evolution of the Socialist Parties.

V.

No sooner had the Majority Socialists become the responsible rulers of Germany than a strong opposition to them began to make itself felt among the masses in Berlin and in the industrial districts. These elements gravitated towards the Independent Socialist Party (I.S.P.). In the early days of the Revolution, when the six People's Commissaries seized the reins of government, the Majoritarians and the Independents had divided the power between them. But even before the National Assembly had met, it became apparent that no government which included the Independents could function. Their demands, which were clearly intended to pave the way to revolution, would (if conceded) have inevitably led to a general upheaval. Then came the National Assembly, to which only a small number (21) of Independents was elected. These declined to take any part in the new government, preferring to play the role of Opposition. At the new elections (June, 1920) to the Reichstag the Independents won a large number of seats from the Majoritarians and became the second strongest party. But as they grew in numbers, a new ultra-radical wing began to form itself amongst them.

The Spartacus riots, which disturbed Berlin during the first winter after the Revolution, gave birth to the Communist Party. This Party, most of whose adherents were to be found in Munich, secured two seats in the new Reichstag. It rejected the parliamentary system

and strove for the dictatorship of the political Councils. But it also was soon faced with a rival in the Communist Workers' Party. Some of the leaders of this latter Party played for a time with the idea of an alliance between the proletariats of Germany and Russia to fight Western Capitalism. Communism had a disintegrating effect on the Independent Socialist Party and finally split it into a right and left wing (Summer, 1920). Some months later the left wing, which counted amongst its leaders the bitterly anti-religious Adolf Hoffmann, fused with the Communist Party under the common name of the United Communist Party. This new Party now joined the Third (Moscow) International. But the Communist Workers' Party also found favour in the eyes of Moscow. So the confusion is great. As the Majority Socialists are affiliated to the Second International, the Independents have been sarcastically dubbed the $2\frac{1}{2}$ International.

Sorry indeed is the picture which the once solid phalanx of German Socialism presents to-day. The fall from power of the Majority Socialists did effect a certain reconciliation between the rival factions. But unfortunately this was secured at the expense of the orderly and constitutional development of the Party.

On the other hand, the non-socialist democratic parties are not one whit more united. It is true that in the domain of economics and within the National Economic Council a group, with a common anti-socialist programme, has been formed. It is also true that the president of the Christian Trade Unions, Adam Stegerwald,[1] has been trying of late to make the same idea materialise in politics. He urges the creation of a Party whose programme should have the following essential notes: Christian, national, democratic, social.

All are of one mind with Stegerwald that the backbone of this new Party should be the present Centre and with it the Catholic element in the population. But

[1] [Herr Stegerwald is at present Prime Minister of Prussia. For an account of the Christian Trade Unions in Germany see STUDIES, March, 1916.—Editor.]

whether it will succeed in attracting any considerable numbers from the social-democratic and labour camps remains to be seen. It is at any rate certain that in the ranks of the Socialists to-day there are very many who are adherents only in name or adherents simply because they consider the Socialists to be better champions of their economic interests. But apart altogether from those who still linger in the socialist camp, there are in the Confederation of German Trade Unions (which embraces the Christian Trade Unions and the Christian National Union of Employees and Public Officials) nearly two and a half million members. Before the war the proportion of Christian to Socialist Trade Unionists was 1 to 7; to-day it is more like 1 to 4.

VI.

But a Christian policy embracing all ranks and classes must, if it is to succeed, be based on the *Gemeinwirtschaft* already explained. And the future of this economic policy depends on the realisation of the Councils system as required by Article 165 [1] of the Constitution. Now the first law passed in fulfilment of this Article was the Industrial Councils Law, the main purpose of which is to secure to the workers direct representation in the management of the industries to which they are indentured. This indeed indicates no great advance on the workers' committees already existing in big factories. But it gives the workers' representatives on the Board of Management an opportunity of knowing the financial position of the firm. This in itself is a step forward and may prove of great significance. No one to-day seeks to bring about the socialisation of the coal mines by the once vaunted panacea of nationalisation, but rather by making the miners themselves shareholders or part-owners of the whole concern. Employers and

[1] The text of this Article will be found cited as an appendix at the end.

Christian workers meet together in the National Economic Council to discuss the ways and means of realising this ideal. If it should materialise, it will stand as an important landmark on the road to a new and more Christian order of things. Ownership of the means of production, so far from being abolished, would on the contrary be more widely distributed. The worker, now a shareholder with direct representation on the Board of Management, would naturally feel a keener interest in the successful running of the industry.

The law dealing with this matter is being applied with extreme caution; and this is very necessary, in order to allow people time to grow into its spirit. In the domain of economics, as in all others, the main thing is education in democracy, without which a law of this kind would be a dead letter. If only the Industrial Councils become penetrated with the spirit of true democracy, with a sense of duty, with the will to work together for the common good—above all, if they succeed in steering clear of street politics—then will they prove apt instruments in bringing about a closer association between employers and workers.

Besides the Industrial Councils the Constitution provides also for the creation of District Economic Councils and for a central or National Economic Council. This provision still awaits application. So far there exists only a temporary National Economic Council, formed mainly of delegates from the employers' and workers' unions. This Council will doubtless some day be faced, on the ground of common economic interests, with the task of appeasing the fury of political strife and of reconciling the different rival parties. That the Economic Councils will strengthen the position of the skilled trades and professions seems inevitable. Now this element of the community, though always anxious to keep abreast of the times, is by nature cautious and chary of rash experiments. The result of this will be a certain conservative strain in the national life. And we may count

on this even if the National Economic Council never develops into a regular Upper Chamber. There is, therefore, good reason to expect that the economic structure contemplated in Art. 165 of the Constitution will have a quieting and stabilising effect on the different strata of German life. The consolidation of the economic system and the cessation of abnormally frequent strikes must result in a corresponding change for the better in the social relations and moral life of the people.

Such is the picture of the German people in travail over a new birth. Much internal strife will still no doubt retard their progress. Menacing indeed is the incubus of an impossible Peace Treaty, whose rigid application threatens to continue the dreadful death-ravages of the war, not only amongst the manhood of the nation but also among its women and children. But the German people have not yet abandoned hope. They cannot and will not be persuaded that all sense of justice and humanity has departed from the earth.

CONSTANTIN NOPPEL.

ARTICLE 165 OF THE GERMAN CONSTITUTION.

Workers and employees are called on to co-operate with the employers on a basis of equality, in regulating wage and work conditions and in furthering the general economic development of the forces of production. The organisations of either side and their agreements shall be recognised.

Workers and employees shall, for the prosecution of their social and economic interests, receive legal representation in Industrial Councils, and also in District Workers' Councils organised by economic spheres, and in a National Workers' Council.

District Workers' Councils and the National Workers' Council shall be combined with the employers' representatives and local representatives in District Economic Councils and in a National Economic Council, for the execution of their economic functions and for joint enforcement of the Socialisation Laws. District Economic Councils and the National Economic Council shall be so constituted as to include representatives of all important professional groups in proportion to their economic and social importance.

Bills on social and economic questions of fundamental importance must be submitted by the Government to the National Economic Council for consideration before being introduced. The National Economic Council is entitled to initiate such bills, and if the Government objects, it must nevertheless submit such draft to the Reichstag with an explanation of its views. The National Economic Council may appoint one of its members to support the bill in the Reichstag.

Functions of control and of administration may be transferred to Workers' and Economic Councils within the sphere assigned to each.

The organisation and objects of the Workers' and Economic Councils, and their relations to other social autonomous bodies, are subject to the exclusive control of the Imperial Government.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

I.—Shakspere and Christianity.

BY PROFESSOR ARTHUR E. CLERY.

LILIAN WINSTANLEY: *Hamlet and the Scottish Succession.* (Cambridge University Press. 1921. 10*s.* net.)

THE last Christian Englishman was named William Shakspere. At least he was the last one of any note. In literature he was also the last Englishman who counted, who counted for Europe (Berkeley, Thomas Moore, Oscar Wilde and Bernard Shaw were Irish; Hume was a Scotchman; Byron perhaps counted for a time). Was it Belloc who said that only three things are known about the English in Europe, their ships, their sanitary arrangements—and Shakspere? A great many characters now attributed to him Shakspere does not possess—a moralist, a philosopher, a psychologist. Other things now kept in the background by his bookworm critics he undoubtedly was—as for instance, an actor, a writer of acting plays, a stage-manager. But behind all else he was a Christian, a normal Christian, wherein he differs from his critics and exponents. He was not sinless by any means. His conduct may have been anything from bad to infamous. But he was a Christian, writing for Christians, none the less. In fact, not only was he a Christian, but a bigot. The objects of his great attack, an attack that his bigoted audience thoroughly appreciated, were the three great enemies of Christian civilisation in his time—Moors, Jews and Lollards. In Othello, Shylock and Falstaff (originally Oldcastle) he has given us pictures of each of the three. It has required modern criticism to find the portraits flattering. An amusing proof of the victory that has been won over Christianity in England is that each of these characters, a villain to Shakspere's audience, has been made a hero by the modern commentator. A world that regulates its public affairs chiefly on a basis of taking interest on money, its private life by the divorce court, is quite

right in making Shylock—"the Jew that Shakspere drew"—and Othello its heroes, in opening its heart to Falstaff *né* Oldcastle.

And if "modern" civilisation, founded on usury, adultery and unbelief, is a success, Shakspere and his audience were plainly very wrong to show hostility to its precursors. Living in a bigoted age, they displayed "narrowness of mind." If, on the other hand, you realise the mess which the break-up of Christian civilisation has made of Europe—the terrible despair of the vast hordes without faith and without food, and of the creedless rich who have stripped them of their property—you may perhaps understand why some people, of whom Shakspere was one, sympathised with the Christian point of view and abominated those who were setting out to destroy it. The way in which Shakspere's modern exponents conceal this, the most fundamental thing in his attitude towards life, is bitterly funny. They tell us everything about him save this. He is acclaimed as the teacher of every philosophy except his own, which was by no means obscure. One of his most popular modern critics, for instance, would have us know that Shakspere's ghosts are not real ghosts, but rather—I forget what particular absurdity fills the blank.

Miss Winstanley, though she has plainly little in common with Shakspere's intellectual position, has the good sense to recognise, the honesty to admit what this position really was. Her clever introduction, in which she reasons on the basis of what Shakspere must have meant to his audience—a true touchstone of interpretation—is much the best thing in a book of which the main thesis is entirely wrong. The following passages concerning Othello, Shylock and Falstaff respectively illustrate her methods :—

> The Moors were, in the sixteenth century, the most formidable opponents of Christian Europe; their valour had threatened its complete overthrow and since they were heathen and formidable opponents at one and the same time, they were regarded as the accepted types of villainy. We see this in the second book of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, where the three Saracens are the most formidable opponents of the knight Guyon; we see it in Shakspere's own *Titus Andronicus* where the Moor is represented as absolutely black, and also a villain of the most dreadful type.
>
> Even modern critics like Coleridge and Charles Lamb feel a distinct repulsion. . . . But the prejudice excited in Charles Lamb's mind must have been as nothing compared to the prejudices excited in the minds of an Elizabethan audience for whom a Moor's black face was simply the accepted symbol for the villainy of a Moor's black soul.
>
> Try and imagine a dramatic author of to-day doing anything really comparable! Try and imagine him representing a hero who murders an innocent wife and attempts the murder of an innocent friend; supposing that, notwithstanding these dreadful facts, he wishes to awaken the utmost sympathy for the murderous hero. Will he begin by making his hero a Prussian officer? Of course not! Our dramatist knows perfectly well that his audience have a prejudice against Prussian officers

of the intensest possible kind, that they will certainly, from the very outset, consider the hero a villain and that they will certainly, from the very outset, expect him to do something unjust and abominable. Surely no dramatist would so far stultify his own dramatic intention ?

And yet even the case of the Prussian officer is not strong enough, for it does not include the colour bar. Imagine a Prussian officer who is also a negro, and imagine the play acted before an audience of Southern State Americans ! . . .

Now, how do our critics get out of this difficulty ? They never meet it fairly. They simply assume, like Mr. Bradley, that Shakspere was gloriously original, gloriously in advance of his age.

. . . . . .

Another example may be chosen from *The Merchant of Venice*. It is very generally admitted that Shakspere's portrait of a Jew villain is probably in part due to the great excitement caused by the trial of a Jew, Roderigo Lopez, for the attempted murder of the queen and Don Antonio : Lopez was executed in 1594.

Shakspere, in drawing the portrait of the Jew villain, was availing himself of what was just then a strong popular excitement against the Jews. So much is admitted !

. . . . . .

The fact of his [Oldcastle's] improvement was simply a historic fact, and the audience knew well enough the reasons for it ; the historic Henry had strained himself to the utmost in the effort to save his old friend from the ire of enraged ecclesiastics, and, even when he was imprisoned, had tried to persuade him to recant. How could the audience think Henry severe when they knew that the true offence was a political one, and that a continuance of the friendship on Henry's part would have brought down the dynasty ? Surely this sheds a different light on Henry ?

It also throws light on other portions of the play. Falstaff repeatedly claims a great reputation for military skill, a European reputation in fact, for he says that he is "Sir John to all Europe." Now a good many critics treat this as simple absurdity on his part, but it is perfectly accurate ; *Oldcastle was acknowledged* as one of the greatest soldiers of his day. Whether Shakspere meant him to *deserve* his reputation or not is an entirely different point, but he certainly possessed it. Canon Ainger has shown that a great deal in the character of Falstaff can be explained by the fact that the Elizabethan conception of him was that of a renegade Puritan, and it is surely equally appropriate to remember that he had the reputation of being a great soldier. That is the joke of the battle of Shrewsbury.

In the last cited example Miss Winstanley probably exaggerates the knowledge of history possessed by a Shakspere audience, but she sees their point of view clearly enough.

It may be admitted that Shakspere and his audience tended to identify ideas with those who profess them, which is the essence of what is called bigotry. No people, for instance, have suffered more from the break-up of the Christian economic system, the institution of a social system founded on the taking of interest on money than the Jews themselves, the poorer Jews. The exploitation of poorer Jews by capitalism has meant a bulk of suffering far greater than the torments inflicted on individual Jews in the Middle Ages. The mediœval Jew lent money, as the Belfast Catholic sells whiskey.

The vile trade was left to him. But Shakspere, following a natural popular tendency, identifies the Jew, as Jew, with the usurer, the enemy of Christianity. This was unjust, unscientific. But in view of what has happened since, it was natural he should do so. In our day we witness the result of the usurer's triumph. Shylock has come into his own ; he has set up the Grand Orient.

Miss Winstanley is unusually right in most of her premises. Especially is she right in protesting against those who would read into Shakspere more than is to be found there—those who make him out a psychologist, for instance. It is the unhappy fate of all great dramatists that they fall into the hands of students and philosophers, men of the temperament most opposed to their own. So Sophocles fell into the hands of Aristotle. Shakspere was an actor and an actor-manager. Like the Greek dramatists (and indeed the Irish dramatists of to-day), he wrote for an audience that had little taste for the written word. An unliterary audience is almost a condition of first-class dramatic production. Your student of literature cannot give himself up whole-heartedly to a play. And without complete surrender there is no real appreciation of drama, and therefore no real drama. You get things like Tennyson's *Becket*. As against this, Shakspere's commentators are men whose taste is almost wholly for the written word, who are therefore least capable of appreciating a play, as they are wholly out of touch with the circumstances of dramatic production. Hence it comes that the " sauvage ivre "—drunk with beauty—is misrepresented into a philosopher and a modern, a psychologist who would lovingly analyse for you the Jews, Moors and money-lenders of his affection. Plots in all probability rushed together by a genius in a hurry, with the pleasant expectation that they " would be all right on the night," are subjected to a tremendous analysis, like that of a great judge in a murder case, an analysis that they will not bear. It is at this point that Miss Winstanley comes in to warn us " never to forget the audience."

Having said so much for Miss Winstanley's premises, one need only add that her conclusion is wholly wrong and is probably wrong just because she has, one fancies, little sympathy with Shakspere's brand of Christianity. For she sets out to prove that the tragedy of *Hamlet* is, and was understood by an Elizabethan audience to be, a dramatisation of James I.'s early family history. Claudius equating with Bothwell. No doubt, especially if you know details of Scotch history which an English audience was little likely to know, there is a certain resemblance between the two tragic stories. But is it conceivable that Shakspere, the fellow-

conspirator of Essex, the violent partisan of James I., should have pictured his patron as Hamlet? The thing is impossible. If it had been Fortinbras, one could understand. Spenser might indeed call Elizabeth "Mercilla" on the score of her mercifulness, as Miss Winstanley reminds us. But the feature of Mary Stuart's story which an Elizabethan audience was most likely to recall, was her execution by "Mercilla," the subject of Schiller's tragedy, but not of Shakspere's. There is nothing in *Hamlet* even faintly touching on it. And is it conceivable that Shakspere would dare to accuse his patron's mother of incest? The highest it can be put is that Shakspere must have known some at least of the features of James's sad story when writing *Hamlet*, and that there are certain points of resemblance; that his audience would have recognised any of them is far more doubtful. The identification, if one is to look for identifications, of Polonius with Cecil, the enemy of Shakspere's party, is much more plausible.

It is not, however, Miss Winstanley's results, but the method she suggests that is admirable. In bringing back the theatre, the audience, and in fact the whole actor-life into the study of Shakspere, she has gone a long way towards bringing back sanity into the criticism of his plays. She has rescued him from philosophers and professors.

ARTHUR E. CLERY.

II.—An Impression.

BY MICHAEL CREVEQUER.

THOMAS MACDONAGH: *Pagans. A Modern Play in two Conversations.* (Talbot Press. 1920. 1*s.* net).

SUBTLETY and intellectual vivacity emanate from this play. I am reminded of the fine grey spirals that curve graciously from a quenched candle. This "modern drama" appears to me as a well-wrought extinguisher wherewith the author sought to mould the eager flame of his restless metaphysical mind. The extinguisher must look black and inflexible to the light it is destined to cover. So the dramatic form must have appeared to the author of *Literature in Ireland*. His mind fanned by the bright wings of abstract perception had not yet succeeded in clapping this Ariel into the cleft oak of humanity. To me, when I saw the first performance of the play in 1915, the mutinous sprite was perhaps more attractive than he would have been had his Prospero accom-

plished his subjection. For our student days are all festivals sacred to the theorist, and most of us then are too gravely playing at reality to wish for the disillusionment of seeing reality played.

Since those days the Irish Theatre in Hardwicke Street has become a loom of embroidery, and Dublin has become a loom of life and death where the young Prospero, leaving his half-subdued Ariel and casting aside his magic gear, has stepped down among the weavers.

The splendour of the fabric glowing before us makes the critic desirous to write, kneeling, of the books of any of those who in their life and death succeeded in weaving such a fair design from the threads of glory and reality that most of us keep in separate skeins, or fray and tangle into horrible confusion. But the only true homage of a book is criticism.

When I imply that *Pagans* is a play more attractive to students than to people of less static judgment it is not my wish to segregate the play in academic bookshelves, but loosely to characterise its quality. Its appeal is, in fact, purely to the intellect. It is like the endless stimulant of students' discussions. In two conversations Thomas MacDonagh puts before us some of his subtle psychological observations, and his theories as to the underlying laws of humanity.

It is absorbing and undramatic. Take away the names, and amalgamate a large number of the speeches, by making the grammatical person uniform, and one could read the theoretical talk in the less broken form of an essay. In spite of this coldness there is an atmosphere of alert thought, and fine feeling for nuances that awakes one to mental excitement. We are never bored or suspicious of insincerity when we listen to the quick tireless hunter of ideas, the ever curious seeker of new doors, who perhaps found his true expression in critical work. Thomas MacDonagh is more philosopher than dramatist. The play does not leave us with any sense of the personality of the characters, but it awakens speculative ardour.

In 1915 we traversed wet streets beginning to warm with a little honeyed sunlight, on our way to the gloom and fantasy of the Hardwicke Street Theatre. In the quiet side street we found, with satisfaction, the unsuspected door opening outwards like the portal of a magic hill. A crooked passage, lit by the low entrance of an incredible little cobbled courtyard beyond, led us to the dim interior of the theatre, peopled by the usual white dematerialized faces and vehement undertone of a Repertory audience.

On the stage blue curtains in great austere folds made a semi-circle broken somewhere by the tall black stem of a pedestal bearing a tiny white cast of the Victory from the Louvre. Against this background John and Frances FitzMaurice and Helen Noble moved in their modern clothes, as calmly as the abstractions of a morality play. Their words lightly touched the thoughts slumbering in our brains and woke them to a gay ferment.

This may be said of all Thomas MacDonagh's work. He has an evocative power which is, as a rule, limited to the dominion of ideas.

Issuing forth into the lamplit April evening we felt impelled to run down the crowded length of O'Connell Street, talking as we ran, dodging round the pedestrians, and meeting again to continue our conversation, and finally reaching our rooms in a fever to prolong till morning the festive ecstasy *Pagans* had aroused among our own half-formulated theories on a thousand subjects.

"It is well for a poet that he is double lived. He has two stores of power," says John FitzMaurice in his foreshadowing of the author's own destiny. Thomas MacDonagh did not mingle these two stores, but he worked equally at amassing treasure for both of them. Herein lies the strength and weakness of all his work.

M. C.

REVIEWS.

Biography.

HENRY EDWARD MANNING: HIS LIFE AND LABOURS. By Shane Leslie, M.A. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne. 1921. Pp. xxiv., 516. 25*s*. net.

MOST of the Preface to this thoroughly interesting volume is devoted by Mr. Leslie to placing it, as a biography, with regard to Purcell's *Life* of Cardinal Manning. The later biographer does his book much less than justice when he declares that it "must appear as a supplement rather than as a supplanter." It is in fact a completely co-ordinate, and not a subordinate work; and the reader is drawn on, as chapter follows chapter, to wish that Mr. Leslie had expanded the book a little, so as to deal with the main situations adequately enough to enable Purcell's *Life* to be dispensed with. What are missing throughout the series of chapters on separate topics, are concise statements on each of the main situations and human problems regarding which Manning is portrayed as in what may be called vehement action. The reader is not given, save in rare and fugitive flashes of the pen, any summary of the background and the surroundings of the scenes depicted; often he has even to form a concept of the various actors from casual allusions, recondite and even cryptic in their nature. The main content of Mr. Leslie's work is so rich in substantive information, and is so vividly set forth, that it is a pity to have to seek historical and personal setting for it elsewhere.

The riches of this fine and worthy volume lie, of course, in the wealth of "personal" quotations from letters and private papers. Particularly in the chapters dealing with the larger public questions is this evident; but there is much valuable substance also in the chapters dealing with Manning's spiritual life in its various stages. Mr. Leslie has to a very high degree the art of picking out the striking personal passage, and of so setting the scene—the comparison with the play imposes itself—with main dialogue, minor comments, and dramatic asides. Read the chapter on the Roman tourney between the Secular and the Regular clergy of England, and, still more vivid, that on the Errington controversy; the true quality dominating this *Life* becomes manifest. From the fifth chapter it sweeps onward to its climax in 1870, and thence

down to its close, in a splendid sequence of scenes. These may be grouped in three main "acts"—the Wiseman act, the Vatican act, and the Democratic act.

The general result of the whole panorama—the word is a fair one in this case—is to retrieve the unfortunate and unduly permanent impression left by Purcell's *Life*. The Preface rightly says that this grandiose work leaned too heavily to the human side. The present biography provides a much more worthy balance of natural and supernatural motives. It would be false, in the case of Manning much more than in that of Newman, to endeavour to supersede the natural elements of motive and strands of policy. He was nearly always in vehement action ; and his natural temperament, associations, interests, coloured his conduct even as corresponding traits emphasise themselves in the lives of St. Augustine and St. Bernard, of Innocent III. and Sixtus V.—all, like Manning, not merely instant, but aggressive in their activities. The lights and shadows are equally needed in depicting the parts they played in the splendid drama of spiritual reconstruction which the Church must vary from age to age and from clime to clime in her struggle for the salvation of men.

To the wealth of "personal quotations" in each chapter Mr. Leslie contributes the binding narrative. This narrative, too, is deeply affected by the dramatic impulse. It is allusive and elusive ; it has little of objectivity and much of audacity. The writer enters thoroughly into the work of stage-managing and effect-producing. In a word, he is terse in touching on a thousand topics and deft in all the devices of the versatile reviewer ; but he exhibits rather the clever craft of the journalist than the firm weaving that we expect from the judicious biographer. Such workmanship as that of Mr. Leslie has its very special good qualities : it is brilliant in its varied flashings, and it is never dull, never even staid or weighty. But it leaves the suggestion that with much the same sources the scenes might, by another skilled hand, be so re-written as to transform the total character of the action. And the suggestion becomes more insistent when one weighs the importance assigned, in the narrative and in the dialogue, to the gossamer of gossip, spoken and written.

This method of treatment gives, as is to be expected, great scope to the biographer for the direct or indirect expression of his own views and his own leanings. The result is that while many momentous incidents in the public and pastoral career of Manning receive their due measure, others, in which Manning's very soul was centred, are hurried over or handled with less than Mr. Leslie's

usual zest. Such is the vital question of Catholic Education in England. It is plain that Mr. Leslie has no appreciation of the issues involved in the University aspect of Education, and that he is quite out of sympathy with Manning's great stand for Catholic principles and practice concerning it. It is a revelation to read that "Provost Mahaffy is the authority for the statement that conversion at Trinity has been five to one in favour of Rome. At Oxford it was a hundred to one." Surely to a Catholic Bishop, having charge of souls of Catholics, it is the *one* that matters. And it is by no means clear that the policy of separate higher education for Catholics was not then, and is not now, a noble policy, and a sound policy. University Education in England is not mainly or even largely a question of the two per cent. of Catholics who are found at Oxford, or of the two per cent. found at Cambridge. The Catholic students at the English Universities could, if brought together, supply in ample measure a great and growing Catholic University centre with students and with professors. Manning was well justified in working, even a generation in advance, towards such a result. The results in Holland, in America, in Belgium, and in many other countries, of the stiff Catholic policy of standing out for the Separate School and the Separate College and the Separate University have been always successful; it is the declared policy of the Holy See, and tolerated deflections from it have slender guarantees of true achievement. It is so, too, with the vital issue of the Catholic education of the masses of the poor Catholics in England: the glory of Manning's spending of himself in its service is but glimpsed at rare intervals in these chapters.

Fourscore pages of Mr. Leslie's work are devoted to Ireland. Most of these pages bear on the Eighties: it may be said, as is often the case in modern history, that the more recent past has the less of actuality. It is otherwise with the chapter on the Sixties. Suffice it to quote from one of Gladstone's letters to Manning about Ireland (February 17, 1865), the assertion that

"I do not admit that the Queen holds it by coercion. Ireland has 105 representatives in the Commons";

and to add to it, from Manning's reply seven days later, the writer's conviction that

"We hold Ireland by force, not only against the will of the majority, but in violation of all rights—natural and supernatural."

Of such statements the great argument is ever fashioned; and for a wealth of similar matter we are deeply indebted to Mr. Leslie.

T. C.

Celtica.

BEALLTAINE 1916 *AGUS DANTA EILE.* Le Piaras Béaslaí. Ath Cliath: Cló na Saoirse. 1921. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Is leasc linn "filíocht" a thabhairt mar ainm ar shaothar scriobhnóirí ár linne féin. Nuair a bhuaileann file umainn ag gabháil an bhothair dúinn ní aithnighmíd é mar fhile is ní chuirimid spéis fé leith ann. "Duine linn féin" is eadh é, ar ndóigh. "Ta ré na bhfilí mór caithte." Deirtear nac bhfuil éinne 'na fháidh 'na thír féin. Agus go deimhin ni bhíonn an file 'na fhile i measc a mhuintire ach chó bheag; 'Na thaobh san is uile, bionn árd-mheas ag cách ar cheól an fhile nuair a bhíonn a chorp 'na luaith fé 'n bhfód. Baineann na ollmhna abhar lectiúrí fada as a chuid bhéarsaí, molann síad a bhfuil ionmolta ionnta gan scáth, gan saint.

Tá fás nua fé litriocht na nGael ó 'n Eirighe Amach i leith. Tá filíocht 'ga cumadh in Eirinn fé láthair gur fiú trácht uirthe mar fhilíocht. Do cuireadh amach "*Cuisle na hEigse*" ráithe ó shoin agus is breágh, ceolmhar, an cnuasach é. Níos déanaighe fós cuireadh i gcló "*Bealltaine* 1916 *agus Dánta eile*" le Piaras Béaslaí. Oirbheart mhór thairbheach i bhfás litríochta na h Eireann is eadh teacht cun críche an leabhair seo "Bealltaine 1916."

An saghas filíochta a thugtai "lyric" air i dteangachaibh eile ní raibh sé i réim le linn ré na mBárd nGaelach insna meadhonaoiseanna. Ba bheag an taithighe a bhí ages na filíbh in aon bhall fé 'n am san, ar an "lyric" díreach mar is aithne dhuinn anois é. San tseana-litríocht Cheilteach ní 'l teora leis. Ní 'l a sharú' i seanlitríocht an domhain tá sé chó áluinn, chó simplidhe sin. Tá cuid de'n áilleacht céadna, is cuid de 'n simplídheacht céadna ag baint le furmhór na ndánta so "*Bealltaine* 1916"—cé go bhfuil rian litríochta na seachtmhadh aoise déag, is na h-ochtadh aoise déag, go soléir ortha. Sé sin le radh: tá an samhlú, is an fhirinne, is an fraochtacht a chuireann anam is éifeacht i bhfilíocht 'ga nochtadh ionnta, i bhfuirm meadarachta na mbárd ba mhó aicillidheacht um an dtaca úd a raibh feabhas crota ag cur an cúraim go léir ar bhárdaibh na Scoile. Ní miste a rádh go dtuigeann an file seo "céard chruaidh an fhile" ó thuis go deire. Is beag duine a bhfuil tuigsint níos fearr aige anois, ar chúrsaibh meadarachta na sean. 'Seo sómpla a chuirfidh i-n-iúl nár theip fiú amháin an Deibhidhe air—

Mairg mise aimsir na gile
Sínte seal im thréith-chime
Fada an téarma chaiteas thall
Fe ghlasa géura dubh-Ghall.

Do chum sé *An Dóchas* i bhfuirm Sheadna—

Do chuala do mharbh, a mhaighdean,
O dhaoimbh nár ghnathuigh gó
Níor chreid mé an cuntas ó einne
Níor dhúchas dom géille dhó.

Tá "*An Sprid's an Cholann*" cumtha i Seadna leis, ach chuir an file atharú i ngnáth cheól Shéadna agus is binnede an laoi an t-atharú san. Ach tá tréithe spéiseamhla, is buadha nach iad, sa duanaire. Ní leór binneas cheoil is deiseacht crota. Bhíodh "cion ar chéill i nduan" ann, aimsir na saoithe is na draoithe, agus tá an cion céadna ag lucht léighte indui. Fear mór-eachtra is eadh ughdar an leabhair seo. Ní gnáth leis cathaoir-uilleann cois teineadh agus dubhluachar na bliadhna amuigh; ba bheag a dhúil a suaimhneas is i síothcháin an fhaid is bhí Eamonn ar fán "fé shncachta 's fé shioc." Tá a lán scéalta aige le h-innsint, agus ní scéalta fiannaidheachta iad.

Dubhairt Wordsworth, uair, go ndeineann an file an obair is fearr nuair atá uain aige a chuid eachtra d' ath-fhuiling i gciúineas is i n-uaigneas, agus iad do scrí' sios annsan. Bhí breis is a dhá dhóthain d' uain machtnaimh is de chiúineas ag file na "laoithe gaisge" seo agus é—

"Ag gallaphuic ghrána saitte i ndaorbhruid"

—má's féidir ainm chó taithneamhach le "ciúineas a thabhairt ar dhíomhaointeas dithreórach an phríosiún. Tá rian a shaoghail bhuarta ar a shamlú is ar chasadh a smaointe. Luigheann sé go trom air, is cuireann sé sgáth ar mhire a aigne is ar ghile a mheóin. Ni locht in ao'chor é sin; dá léire peictiúr a cháis is eadh is fearr: filíocht "lyrical" atá 'ga chanadh aige—díreach mar an fhilíocht do chum Shelley nuair a bhí na slabhrai throma ga tharraing síos, is réalta na spéire 'ga mhealladh nios giorra do'n bhflaitheas :—

Ta mo cholann seal i gcarcair
Ach lem sprid níl srian na srang
Beag mo bheann ar pheannaid géibheann
Gearr a leanfaidh réimeas Gall.

Ta súil ag lucht léighte na Dantá so go bhfuighidh an file tuille amhrán mar iad do sholáthar dóibh, nuair a bheidh deire le "réimeas Gall" san Saorstát Gaelach. L. F.

IOMARBHÁGH NA bhFILEADH. The Contention of the Bards. Edited with Translation, Notes, Glossaries, etc., by Rev. L. McKenna, S.J., M.A. 2 Vols. London: Irish Texts Society. 1918 [1920]. 21*s.*

EARLY in the seventeenth century a controversy broke out between the leading Irish poets of the day as to whether Leath Mhogha or Leath Chuinn, the North of Ireland or the South, was entitled on historic grounds to claim precedence. This controversy, which has come to be known as the "Contention of the Bards," forms an

important landmark in our literature, and an edition of it has long been a desideratum. In the latest volumes of the Irish Texts Society Father McKenna has crowned his many signal services to Irish scholarship by giving us an edition of the "Contention" which is in every way as complete as could reasonably be expected. The editor's labour was rendered all the heavier by the fact that copies, partial or complete, of the "Contention" are found in so many MSS. Father McKenna enumerates no less than 49 MSS. which he has consulted, nor does this long list exhaust the number of available copies.

The "Contention" was the last great effort of the professional bardic class, which owing to the ruin of its patrons was just then hastening rapidly to decay. One cannot but admire the dexterity with which the poets who participated in it wove their arguments into verse. But what most impresses a reader of to-day is the artificiality and futility of the whole controversy. Here were poets so immersed in the pedantry of their class that they could argue hotly and at length about far-off myths like Eibhear and Éireamhón, but had scarcely a word to say about the one historical fact that mattered—the grim reality of the English conquest. Truly they were, as Florence Conry put it, "dogs wrangling over an empty kennel."

The full text of the "Contention" runs to over 1,600 quatrains, and to edit and translate all this verse was a heavy task which few could have accomplished so successfully as Father McKenna. One might, perhaps, object in places to the translation as being somewhat colloquial and prosaic, when one considers the archaic character of the original; and there are also places in which the accuracy of the rendering given seems open to question. Regarding Tadhg mac Dáire much more information is available than the editor appears to have been aware of; while O'Flanagan's account, upon which he relies, can be shown to be untrustworthy in almost every detail. The Eoghan MacCraith who took a minor part in the controversy was certainly not the John McCragh who was pardoned in 1573. A number of the MSS. identify this Eoghan MacCraith with Eoghan son of Donnchadh Maol, known otherwise as the author of some religious pieces; and there seems no good reason against accepting this testimony. His secular compositions would show Eoghan MacCraith to have been a Clareman who flourished A.D. 1620-1658. One of these latter pieces has borrowed its first line (*Tug damh th'aire, a Innse an Laoigh*) from an earlier poem by Maoilín Og MacBruaideadha; but the two poems are otherwise distinct, though Father McKenna confuses them. T. O'R.

Classics.

COMMENT LA BELGIQUE FUT ROMANISEE. Essai historique par Franz Cumont. Deuxième Edition. Bruxelles : Lamertin. 1919. 7 fr. 50.

THIS masterly essay, a reprint from the *Annales de la Société Royale d'Archéologie de Bruxelles* (1914), deserves the attention of our Celtic scholars. Roman Belgium, like Roman Britain, can never lack interest for those who wish to follow the story of Celtic civilisation in Europe, and M. Cumont has given us what has long been an obvious want : a connected, authoritative account of the archaeological evidence hitherto discovered and classified. His essay is short—120 pages in all, with 68 illustrations—but it is a model of its kind. Analogous in scope to Professor Haverfield's *Romanisation of Roman Britain*, it is an invaluable storehouse of all the minute details of archaeological and administrative policy which make up the history of any Roman province. The conquest, the work of organisation, road-building, industries, commerce, education, artistic and general culture, the brief story of final collapse ; these are the chapters of M. Cumont's essay, and it will be seen that the whole is an admirable and useful appendix to M. Jullian's *Histoire de la Gaule.*

Before such a mass of detail it is of little use to single out facts which are better left to be studied in their context. There is, however, one point where commentary may be useful, as M. Cumont does not seem to have appreciated to the full its proper significance. On p. 91 he prints a photograph of a fragmentary sepulchral store preserved in the local museum of Arlon : a reproduction will also be found in Espérandieu's *Bas-reliefs de la Gaule* (vol. v., No. 4103), published shortly before M. Cumont's essay. M. Cumont's description is worth quoting : "The fragment shows us a schoolmaster of seventeen centuries ago. Clothed in the Gallic cloak and hood, and armed with a ferula, he watches sternly over his class, whilst one of his pupils is working at the blackboard." M. Cumont's essay would be worth buying, if it were only for a glance at this reproduction ; for this Belgian "schoolmaster of seventeen centuries ago," with his rough, pleasant features, his national garb, and his air of grim determination, is really an important personage in European history. He is the only surviving representative of a class which did much for the creation and preservation of that "Pax Romana" which has made Western Europe what it is to-day. Not that there is no other evidence as to the existence of schoolmasters in ancient Gaul. The *Corpus Inscriptionum* con-

tains a score or so of epitaphs of "grammatici" and "rhetores" who taught in one or other of the towns of Gaul; Suetonius, Juvenal and Tacitus tell us of the success with which Gauls cultivated the study of Roman eloquence within a century of Caesar's conquest; and Latin literature of the third and fourth centuries bears ample witness to the prestige of Roman Gaul as a home of literature. But all these references are to the education of the upper classes, and the "grammatici" and "rhetores" taught in what we should now call secondary schools. What of the peasant-folk? Anyone who has tried to follow up the history of Roman education will not be surprised to hear that evidence for elementary schools in Gaul is wholly lacking. Classical literature has nothing but contempt for these *ludi litterarum*, and the few references to be found in Latin authors (with the exception of a famous allusion in St. Augustini's *Confessions*) do not take us outside of Italy. And the evidence of inscriptions is as unsatisfactory. One inscription has often been quoted: the *Lex Metalli Vipascensis*, in which a clause provides for the establishment of an elementary school (as well as of a barber's shop, and many other curious details) in this Roman mining-community, organised in Spain towards the end of the first century. But that is all, and it is just for this reason that the Arlon tombstone seems to me to be of unusual interest.

There is no inscription, but the few details given by the sculptor are sufficient for anyone who is familiar with the conventional character of Roman education. Custom required that Roman teachers should wear either the Roman toga, or the short Greek cloak ("paenula" in Latin) worn by the teacher of rhetoric. In strict accordance with this custom we find on a tombstone found at Neumagen and now at Trèves (Espérandieu, 4034; Cumont, p. 92), a "grammaticus" clothed in the conventional toga, and giving his lessons seated—(another conventional tradition)—to two or three privileged pupils. We have, therefore, good grounds for believing that the Arlon tombstone, with its standing figure and its Gallic dress, represents an elementary teacher, and gives us a glimpse into an aspect of Roman administration about which we know only too little. St. Augustine has a striking phrase in his City of God (xix., 7): "Data est opera ut imperiosa civitas non solum iugum, verum etiam linguam suam domitis gentibus per pacem societatis imponeret." The rude figure of this Gaulish schoolmaster, clothed in his national dress and ferula in hand, forms a curious commentary on this passage: all the more curious when we reflect that Roman law, which gave special protection

and privileges to the "grammatici" and "rhetores," expressly excludes elementary teachers from these privileges. Our schoolmaster from Arlon must, therefore, with his many nameless fellow-workers, have taught his countrymen the Roman alphabet, Roman methods of counting, and indirectly Roman habits of thought, unaided by the imperial administration. Yet such was Rome's ascendancy, that these silent workers in the great imperial machine were never wanting; and, though the Celtic language offered a long and stubborn resistance (witness Irenaeus and St. Jerome), it was finally driven from the field.

I have dealt with this single tombstone at some length because it gives some idea of the fascinating horizons opened up by many of the details given in M. Cumont's essay. As to his method of treating the material to hand, I have only one criticism, but it is serious. M. Cumont is telling the story of two civilisations; yet he has eyes only for one aspect of his subject. In all the long enumeration of Belgium's ancient prosperity, no word is thrown out which might suggest that this prosperity was not wholly due to Roman influence. Where the Celts are mentioned, they are mentioned only with contempt. Yet M. Cumont has read M. Jullian's *Histoire de la Gaule*, and must know that there is abundant evidence to be found, in both Greek and Latin literature, for the advanced state of continental Celtic civilisation before Caesar's conquest of Gaul; and that civilisation was not least advanced in the agricultural and industrial activities which formed the main source of Belgium's prosperity under Roman rulers. I must confess to some bewilderment at M. Cumont's attitude. Is it the ardour of a specialist who can see only his own particular subject? Or is it some curious reaction of modern political sympathies? For M. Cumont is at no pains to conceal his admiration for "la culture latine." Whatever the reason, I cannot help regretting that he should have thus thrown across an otherwise admirable study the shadow of some personal prejudice. A. G.

THEORY OF ADVANCED GREEK PROSE COMPOSITION. With Digest of Greek Idioms. Part I. By John Donovan, S.J., M.A. Oxford: Blackwell. 1921. 5*s*.

THERE are many books on the market that treat of Higher Greek Prose Composition, but few that bear the hallmark of the tried teacher. Now Fr. Donovan is an approved pædagogue, having devoted long and fruitful years to "the all-engrossing, if somewhat thankless labour of teaching Greek." In addition, *disce a*

Jesuitis—a Jesuit has usually something good to communicate in matter or method; and method in the present instance is of paramount importance.

The present volume is only the first instalment of a work planned on a four-part system—each chapter however being of independent value and constituting a separate and complete treatise in itself. The author calls it a Theory of Greek Prose, "inasmuch as it offers a scientific exposition of the chief and most difficult of the various processes through which the mind consciously or unconsciously passes in the task of translation into Greek" (p. xii.). And this aim constitutes the unique value of the book.

Fr. Donovan distinguishes a four-fold process in the art of Greek Composition: (1) the framework of the paragraph or the focussing of ideas around the main statement: (2) the linking together of sentences by appropriate particles; (3) the proper choice of words and expressions—wherein lies the main difficulty as well as the educative value of Greek Composition, according to the author; (4) the structure of the individual sentence. In the present volume (Part I.) Fr. Donovan treats of the Syntax and Idiom of the Subordinate Clause, and the Functions and Equivalents of the Parts of Speech (substantive, adjective and adverb, reserving the remaining portions to a later volume). The author is singularly felicitous in his illustration of Greek idiom by copious examples drawn from the various Greek Prose authors—the Attic orators (Isocrates and Aeschines in particular) being drawn upon especially for the purpose. They furnish him with an excellent practical commentary on all he says relative to the theory of Greek Composition. This digest of Greek idioms will be of incomparable value to teacher and student alike, who will gladly enter into another's labours "to reap that in which they have not laboured."

Finally, we can only hope that circumstances will permit of the author's publishing the remaining portion of his work. *Finis coronat opus.*

J. J. C.

Fiction.

THE HOUNDS OF BANBA. By Daniel Corkery. Dublin: Talbot Press. 1920. 4*s.* net.

No one who would study Sinn Fein from within can afford to dispense with this burning and vital book. Among a great portion of the English people there is an easy assumption, which their Press does nothing to remove, that the I.R.A. are just a murder gang. If you tell them that the Volunteer young men are at least as full of ideals as the men who went to the War, they

do not believe you or they are not interested. If you point out to them that the idealism has brought a new face into Ireland, as it certainly has, a regular-featured, large-eyed, large-browed face, at once keen and dreamy, they only stare at you. A very distinguished English novelist said to me the other day: "Why not write an Uncle Tom's Cabin novel about Sinn Fein? You might get at them in that way, since their newspapers dope them and their Government lies to them." Well, I wish I could scatter *The Hounds of Banba* broadcast, not only among these indifferent, immoveable people, but up and down the world. The book is the testament of Sinn Fein. It reveals how the Volunteers regard themselves. This little army, which has no mercenaries, where the probable fate of any soldier is imprisonment and death, the little army which has the great army against it and no law on its side at all except outlawry, could have little reason for its existence unless it regarded its war as a Holy War.

Mr. Corkery reveals its beginnings. We see the old men who waited for it through a sterile time, as the Jews of the Captivity awaited the deliverance. Mr. Corkery is a great painter of old, great old men. Long after this book has been laid aside, but not forgotten, Muirish, the old shepherd, with his "Wisha! Wisha! Wisha!" haunts your thoughts. There is another great old man in another of these stories, "On the Heights." They are just the old men one knows in Ireland—red-faced, beetling-browed, fierce as a sword, with the ashes of old fires that have the core of fire at the heart of them, like the turf, ever ready to leap into life. The stories are variously of a singular beauty. If the novel of Sinn Fein has yet to be written, I think "The Ember" may stand as the *conte* of Sinn Fein. It can hardly be bettered. The whole book is ardent and beautiful. Considering Mr. Corkery's feelings about England—

> Life conquereth still; as dust the whirlwinds blow—
> Alexander, Caesar, and all their power and due;
> Tara is grass, and Troy itself lieth low—
> It may be that Death will reach the English too—

it makes one smile to see what beautiful harmonies he makes of the abhorred tongue. By the irony of things he is born an English stylist. There is compassion and passion, love and bitterness, anger and sweetness in these stories, in which Daniel Corkerry has struck a blow for Sinn Fein which might make its fighting men envious. He is no blind zealot either. In "A Bye-Product" one comes upon the question which must often harrass the soul of the man who lets the wild torrent loose. When the idiot goes out

to slay the first harmless policemen he meets and comes back with his gun :—

One does not linger on a mountain-side when a south-west wind is sweeping a sea of rain against it, but the thing that set Sean O'Leary plunging through the darkness, leaping headlong from rock to rock, was not the discomfort of the rain and wind, but the vision that had seized on his brain—the meagre, death-like figure laid flat upon the bed, the wild creature watching by it, the gun across the huge knees, the fierce grip. And in the light of that vision the task of freeing his native land which he and others like him had taken upon their shoulders, seemed suddenly to have become immensely heavier, infinitely more involved, more surely fraught through and through with living pain.

This is a book of exaltations, and the exaltations are not the less assured and uplifting because the moments of doubt and terror which must lay hold on the heart of him who decrees war are not minimised nor glossed over. To open the flood-gates one has to be either a god or a brute to be without these moments of dark misgiving. KATHARINE TYNAN.

MARIA CHAPDELAINE. Récit du Canada français. Par Louis Hémon. Paris : Grasset. 1921. 6 fr. 50.

THIS most appealing book is just what it is called in its sub-title, a narrative of French Canada—its backwoods and villages, its ice-bound lakes and rivers, its seasons, its customs, its priests and primitive, unlettered people. The inhabitants—who call themselves Canadians, while all other settlers and their descendants keep the name of the country they come from—are jealously attached to their traditions and old language, in which, however, are embedded, quaintly enough, modern anglicisms and proper names of the most diverse origin. In the remoter parts life is a hand-to-hand fight, to wring year by year a few more fields from the primeval forest. And yet to the heroine Maria, beset with suggestions of a city in the States, of well-lit streets, shops and cinemas, of a flat with gas and hot water and still more unthinkable luxuries, a voice speaks of all

the unnoticed joys of the country she wanted to fly from. The almost miraculous apparition of the earth in spring, after the long months of winter. . . A little later the leaf-buds would come out on the birches, alders, and aspens ; the hornbeam wood would be carpeted with pink flowers, and after the forced rest of winter the hard labour of the soil would be almost a festival : to toil from morning till night would seem a blessed privilege.

And after the short torrid summer and the harvest :—

Lo ! by a miracle winter no longer seemed detestable or terrible ; it at least brought the intimacy of the well-closed house, and outside, along with the monotony and silence of the snow-drifts, peace, a great peace.

Above all, Maria suddenly understands what her mother's life has been—oh ! the pathos of that last illness !—as Samuel Chapdelaine, sitting by his dead wife, says :—" The wife of a poor settler has to expect a hard life ; but women who set about their work as capably and cheerfully as she did long ago, there aren't many of them, Maria ! " The mother, too, had had her dream of happiness : a farm with nice flat fertile fields, near enough to a village for the neighbours to come in of an evening, Mass every Sunday, and above all, on Christmas night, " with Yvonne Boilly at the harmonium and Pacifique Simard who sings the Latin so beautifully."

Many scenes stand out in the book, the church-steps on Sunday, the priest's parlour, the *veillées*, the bilberry gathering, the rash mid-winter journey in the woods ; but none strikes its ground-note better than the description of the weather-bound remnant of a family—for the young men are away timber-cutting—singing hymns and old songs on Christmas Eve :—

> They were both moved as they remembered the past, and thought of the candles already lit and the hymns that would soon peal out, celebrating everywhere the birth of the Saviour. Life for them had always been one and simple ; hard necessary work, understanding between husband and wife, submission to the laws of nature and the Church. All these things had been woven into one web, the rites of worship and the details of daily life intertwined so that they would have been incapable of separating the religious emotion that possessed them from their unexpressed affection.

M. R.

THE LAST OF THE IRISH CHIEFS. By Mrs. M. T. Pender. Dublin : Martin Lester. 1921. 7*s.* net.

THE example of Sir Walter Scott as a novelist, is one that not a few Irish men and women have endeavoured to emulate. It must be admitted truthfully, that no successful rival to the " Wizard of the North " has appeared, so far, in our midst. When one considers what a wide field exists for the novelist who would select Irish historical romance as a theme, one cannot but feel surprised that so little has been accomplished in that ample area. The fact remains, however, that we have no historical novelist of the first rank, nor even (except the Banims, perhaps), of the second.

The late Mrs. Pender certainly does not merit to be classed with Scott. There is no reason to believe that she would herself have claimed to rank beside that once-admired but now somewhat antiquated weaver of romance. Her style is popular rather than polished ; her episodes are calculated to appeal more to the easily thrilled than to the earnest thinker. Yet she conveys a suggestion

to the reader that her inspiration comes in a larger degree from Scott than from, let us say, Bulwer-Lytton, or the host of other authors who have dealt with "stirring times," and who loved to write of the clash of steel and the champing of steeds. In the book before us we are reminded at one moment of *Ivanhoe;* at another of *Guy Mannering.* No doubt a wide gulf divides the periods considered in those two novels, but readers of *The Last of the Irish Chiefs* will readily detect in it certain points of similarity to both. It is not suggested for an instant that Mrs. Pender's work is on a level with the famous books mentioned. One fancies, however, that they may have served her as models.

This story, to judge from its general tone, has already appeared in serial form, in some daily or weekly journal. It contains no attempt at character study, no psychological investigations. The period dealt with is that following on the flight of the Earls; the scene is laid in and around Derry. There is, certainly, no lack of incident; battles, burnings, torturings, and hair-breadth escapes throng thick upon each other. At moments indeed one is almost disposed to fancy that one is reading an extract from an Irish newspaper of the twentieth century, instead of a piece of fiction dealing with the seventeenth. It should prove stimulating and instructive for Irish youth, and while it may not prove as educational, from the point of view of syntax and composition, as the works of a more accomplished author, the lessons in history to be derived from it are distinctly more beneficial.

For the rest, the maidens are fair and of wondrous virtue; the soldiers are full of strange (some very strange) oaths; the course of true love does not run smooth; but love's labour is not lost for hero and heroine and—all's well that ends well. W. D.

History.

IRELAND IN THE EUROPEAN SYSTEM. By James Hogan. Vol. I., 1500-1557. London: Longmans. 1920. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Communications between Ireland and foreign States were rendered difficult by repeated invasions of Norman adventurers during the thirteenth and following centuries, but the intercourse never ceased. Under stress of circumstances these international negotiations were resumed with greater vigour in the first half of the sixteenth century, and were pursued with greater frequency and prospect of success. Tudor terrorism and religious persecution combined

to draw all classes of the Irish nation more closely together. Common danger stimulated the consciousness of national unity. So when Henry VIII. of England inaugurated his ruthless attack on the Irish nation in 1520, the importance of fostering international relations gradually came home to even the dullest mind, and when England's defection from the faith had chilled the friendship of foreign nations, the constancy of Ireland won the sympathy of Christendom, which seemed to promise success.

The year 1520 is thus a natural starting-point for investigations into Ireland's international history. Much new information moreover has become available for the succeeding period through the publication in recent years of the State records of those countries with which the Irish nation had the closest intercourse. Utilising these new sources Professor Hogan has succeeded in putting these negotiations in their proper historical setting, and has thus produced a volume which breaks new ground and marks a decided advance in Irish historical studies.

Of the necessity of some such work as this there can be no question. These international negotiations are of the utmost importance for the right understanding of the history of the Irish nation, yet they are treated so summarily (where mentioned at all) by those who write Irish histories, that they are almost completely unknown to the ordinary educated Irish citizen. For such ignorance there will henceforth be no excuse.

In arranging and illustrating for the first time a complicated series of events the avoidance of all irrelevancies and inaccuracies is well-nigh impossible ; and if the writer is inclined to be diffuse, the difficulty and the danger are increased. The pages devoted to Mr. H. G. Wells are evidently out of place in a work which is a serious contribution to Irish History. He has never been regarded as an authority on Irish questions, and his ephemeral productions are of no concern to Irish students.

Many incidental remarks occur throughout the volume which do not help to a clearer understanding of events. Some are erroneous ; others ambiguous ; others, though defensible, are apt to provoke dissent. Thus we are told that the monastic ideal was "the most typical product of the medieval spirit" (p. xvii.). Now the fourth century is not usually reckoned to the Middle Ages, and most people will consider that the Friars, not the Monks, were the most typical product of the medieval spirit. Again the Reformation is said to have effected "the separation of religious and political powers" (p. xxii.), though the contrary might be asserted with far more truth. Neither had Christianity to wait for More or Rousseau

"to perceive the importance and the dignity of the individual soul," as the author seems to imply (p. 38).

The contrast drawn between the Normans and the Tudors is altogether imaginary, nor does the authority of a poet, W. B. Yeats, make it more convincing. "The Normans," according to this theory, "were a sociable, Catholic, Anglo-French race; and being natural wanderers, creatures of impulse, when they settled down in their feudal castles all over Ireland, they were instinctively attracted to the gay, imaginative, personal life of the Irish, and so in course of time they were as Gaelic as the Gaelic (sic) themselves, and life in this new land became sweet to them" (p. xv.). With these "haughty and generous Normans" the author contrasts the servants of the Tudor government in Ireland—"men of set purpose and grim methods, who laboured not to govern Ireland but to conquer it in the English interest" (p. xxiii.).

This Norman "Golden Age" is quite unhistorical. There is no injustice, no cruelty, no barbarity of Tudor or Stuart times that has not its parallel under the Normans. Extermination of the Irish nation by wholesale massacres and iniquitous confiscations was as settled a policy of Norman as of Tudor.

Hear the tale of the victims to be read in the Remonstrance of the Princes and People of Ireland to Pope John XXII, 1318:—

> By vile and fraudulent artifices they have violently driven us from the spacious habitations and inheritance of our fathers into mountains, woods, bogs and caves, and forced us to live there like beasts . . . thus giving rise to implacable enmities and wars, mutual murders, ceaseless depredations, continual rapine, detestable and over-frequent frauds and treacheries . . . by base, infamous and iniquitous laws plotting the extermination of our race (pro gentis nostrae exterminacione leges pessimas statuentes nimis reprobas et iniquas). [1]

Or take that phrase of Sir John Masone's, "These Irish wild beasts should be hunted down" (29 June, 1550), which Professor Hogan says gives us "an insight into the Tudor mentality and the Tudor methods in Ireland" (p. 131): how does it differ from the common dogma of Catholic Anglo-Normans, laity and clergy, "that it was no more a sin to kill an Irishman than to kill a dog or any other brute beast" (quod non magis est peccatum interficere hominem Hiberniacum quam unum canem aut quodlibet aliud animal brutum)? [2] Equally unfounded is the opinion that the Normans were easily or quickly absorbed into the body of the Irish nation. In point of fact they resisted amalgamation more vigorously and more successfully than any other foreign colonies introduced into Ireland. But enough has been said of these gay Normans.

[1] Cf. Fordun's *Scotichronicon*, vol. III, pp. 908 & sq. [2] *Op. cit.*

When Professor Hogan is dealing with the sixteenth century, he is a surer guide. The inaccuracies to be met with are mostly of a kind which more careful proof-reading could have avoided, v.g., M. de Botte (p. 127) becomes M. Le Botte in the pages that follow; and when his mission to Ireland in 1550 is mentioned, we are told in a note that "Le Botte had been in Ireland on two former occasions, once in 1549, and once in 1580" (p. 130). But there is one mistake in dating, of which, as it obscures the sequence of events, it may be well to speak with more detail. Professor Hogan assigns to the month of February, 1549, O'Donnell's oath of fidelity to Henry II. of France, telling us that "De Serigny fixes the date as February, 1553, which is evidently an error" (p. 108*n*). He is to be complimented on detecting that 1553 is a mistake, but De Scrigny has the correct date, "au mois de février, 1550." Indeed the exact day is known, viz., 23 February, 1550. This illustrates the necessity of testing quotations by consulting the original. Professor Hogan writes: "In the early spring, 1549, Wauchop arrived in Ireland from France. . . At the same time Monluc, the Bishop of Valence . . . acting on instructions from Henry proceeded to Ireland. . . In the month of March Monluc accompanied by the Marquis of Fourquevaux . . . sailed into Lough Foyle" (pp. 104-05). In the light of the correct dates it will be seen that much of the narrative in this and the succeeding chapter stands in need of considerable re-arrangement. The correct dates are:—

1549—12 Oct.—Henry II. signed the Instructions to M. de Fourquevaux at Compiègne.

1550—after 2 Feb.—Wauchop is mentioned in C.S.P.I. for the first time as being in Ireland.

1550—17 Feb.—Monluc and Fourquevaux arrived at Culmore in Inis Eoghain.

1550—23 Feb.—Oath of fidelity to Henry II., taken by O'Donnell at Donegal.

1550—26 Feb.—The French ambassadors set sail from Culmore.

1553—Monluc was consecrated Bishop of Valence. (This is the origin of the mistake or rather misprint referred to above).

It would be desirable also to consult the original of the passage in which Froude represents Gonzalo Fernandez as saying: "He [James, Earl of Desmond] told me he had been in alliance with France and had a relation called de Quindel now in the French Army in Italy" (p. 32). This de Quindel, the relation of Desmond, has all the appearance of being a fictitious personage. Surely

the meaning must be: "He had had a relation with a person called de Quindel now in the French Army in Italy," de Quindel being merely the Spanish spelling of the name of the French Count, François de Condalle, in whose presence the Earl of Desmond signed the Treaty of Askeaton (20 June, 1523).

The terms of this Treaty are given in English (p. 16*n*). The terms of the Treaty of Donegal (23 Feb., 1550) are not given at all. Yet treaties and other such conventions are documents of supreme importance for the history of international relations. They are the official records agreed to by both parties, and show how far each was prepared to go. Their observance or non-observance is the test of the honour and sincerity of the contracting parties. They are the fixed points round which preceding and subsequent events must be grouped. They should stand out prominently and, where possible, their exact terms should be reproduced in the original language. That has not been sufficiently attended to in the present work, with the result that the reader carries away no clear idea of the different stages through which the negotiations passed.

The desire to generalise leads to exaggeration. It is going beyond the evidence to say: "From 1540 to 1579, to invade Ireland and make it a basis for operations against England may be said to have been the settled policy of France" (p. 35). If it was the settled policy of France then to invade Ireland, how is it that France never made one serious effort during those years to land troops in Ireland, though she was continually sending them to Scotland? Judging by results, it would be truer to say that it was the settled policy of France not to invade Ireland. France merely played with the project, and used it to apply pressure to England in political negotiations. Professor Hogan's later judgment is more accurate: "Probably France wished to exploit Irish politics for her own purpose. . . The relationship of Ireland to France for the next twenty years [1550-70] is a simple one—France was to assist Ireland, but, if expedient, would desert her" (p. 109.) And he might have added, the latter is what she consistently did.

All the blame for the failure of the Franco-Irish negotiations cannot, however, be justly laid upon France. The Irish princes must bear their share. Excuses may be made for them. Tudor terrorism was more real than French aid. Still their conduct was not such as to inspire the French with any great confidence in their sincerity. It is not necessary to go back to their formal, though insincere, renunciation of Catholicism a few years before to prove this. The very transactions on the occasion of the Treaty of

Donegal suffice. Nothing could be more explicit than O'Donnell's oath of fidelity to the King of France, which Professor Hogan does not print.

Sérénissime et Très Chrétien Roy.

. . . Je promets que tant que je vivray en ce monde moy et le très illustre sieur ô Neill Comte de Tirone, avec tous les Princes et Seigneurs d'Irlande et sans eux et ensemblement et séparément, nous prêterons et rendrons à votre Majesté très fidel service et obéissance, pour nous et nos Successeurs, et à vous et à vos ministres, et serons à jamais en aide contre tous rebelles de votre Majesté, exposerons nous-memes, et les notres et tous nos biens, jusques ce qu'il soit accompli qui est et sera Roy de France, iceluy soit toujours Roy d'Irlande. . .

Ecrit en notre château de Donnegal le 23e jour de Février 1550.

Votre très fidel Serviteur.

O DONELL.

Nine days later, on the 4th of March, the writer of the above letter wrote to inform the English Lord Deputy in Ireland that two great Frenchmen had come to Lough Foyle out of Scotland, and that they intended to do some great deed before Whitsuntide etc. Professor Hogan's comment on this letter is : " O'Donnell's conduct was a miracle of duplicity which certainly was calculated to lull the English into a false security " (p. 114). His conduct was all that is said, but it was more calculated to awaken the distrust of the French than to lull the apprehensions of the English.

JOHN MACERLEAN.

THE HISTORICAL CRITICISM OF DOCUMENTS. No 28. By R. L. Marshall, M.A., LL.D.

A SHORT GUIDE TO SOME MANUSCRIPTS IN THE LIBRARY OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN. No. 32. By R. H. Murray, Litt.D.

IRELAND, 1494-1829. Nos. 33-35. By R. H. Murray, Litt.D.

SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF ROMAN CATHOLICS IN ENGLAND, IRELAND, AND SCOTLAND. No. 39. By John Hungerford Pollen, S.J.

London : S.P.C.K. 1920-1921. No. 28, 1*s.* 3*d.* ; No. 32, 1*s.* 9*d.* ; Nos. 33-35, 1*s.* each (bound in one volume, 3*s.* 6*d.*) ; No. 39, 1*s.* 3*d.*

THESE six booklets are a selection from the large and valuable series of historical handbooks published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. This series is well-known, but not so well-known as it deserves. The fact that it appears under the auspices of a Protestant Society might lead our readers to suspect a sectarian tendency, but with rare exceptions matters of a controversial

character are avoided, or where introduced are dealt with fairly from both points of view. Amongst recent additions to the series, some are for us deserving of particular mention. Dr. Marshall's *Historical Criticism of Documents* is a useful handbook for all historical students. It summarises clearly, but all too briefly, portions of the works of Bernheim and other authorities of first rank on historical method. Father J. H. Pollen's book testifies to the wide researches of its author. It is invaluable to the student of the history of the Catholics of England, but too incomplete on that of the Catholics of Ireland.

Two books in the above list treat directly of Irish affairs,—*A Short Guide to some MSS. in the Library of Trinity College* (Dublin) and *Ireland*, 1494-1829, both by the same author. As far as the material description of the MSS. and the grouping of the authorities for the various historical periods are concerned, these books are worthy of all commendation; but the same cannot be said of the judgment of the author on moral questions nor of his estimate of historical authorities. The author writes from the standpoint of the English colony, and hardly makes any attempt to conceal his prejudices. They colour his whole work and detract from its value. One of the simplest tricks is to give laudatory epithets to those who share his prejudices and to add disparaging remarks to the names of those who don't. Examples of the former method may be found on every page; so it is unnecessary to cite any. The student in search of documents is referred to a number of reputable historians, and among them Robert Ware is enumerated (*Ireland*, 1494-1693, p. 19), without one word of warning that Robert Ware was a notorious forger. His forgeries were, it is true, in the Protestant interest; but, even so, impartiality demands that the student should be warned that he has to do with a forger.

A few examples of depreciatory remarks on writers who do not take the onesided view of the author must suffice. In Mrs. Green's work, *The Making of Ireland*, "dates are so mixed up that it is difficult to follow the arguments advanced" and "her handling of evidence is most unfair." Lecky's *History* before 1780 "possesses no independent value as he had not read the documents, *e.g.*, the depositions of the 1641 rising." Hill's *Plantation of Ulster* "opens with a rose-coloured picture of Ulster before the Plantation." "Mr. T. M. Healy writes a poor work entitled *Stolen Waters*." "The estimates of J. C. O'Callaghan in his *History of the Irish Brigade in the Service of France* cannot be accepted." Prendergast's "references are not impeccable." Gilbert's estimate of the Depositions of 1641 "is a travesty of the truth. . . . It is

evident from his report that Sir John Gilbert was unable to understand the documents which he purported to describe"; and his *Documents relating to Ireland*, 1795-1804, is "a curious collection." Meehan's "*Fates and Fortunes of the Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnel* is a very rhetorical book." Maziere Brady "writes with all the zeal of a convert." Brenan's "*Ecclesiastical History of Ireland* is written for edification," etc., etc.

But the absence of a universal moral standard in the judging of human acts, and unwillingness or inability to give a fair exposition of opposing views wherever questions of nationality and religion arise, are more serious defects in a book intended for the guidance of students than unfavourable estimates of adversaries. They lower what should have been a scientific work to the level of a political or sectarian pamphlet. Speaking of Dr. D'Alton's *History of Ireland*, he says, "It is curious it does not seem to occur to him that Irish chiefs were guilty of treason when they invoked the aid of France or Spain." Were then the Belgian chiefs guilty of treason when they invoked the aid of France and England in 1914? Or is it a virtue to invoke the aid of neighbours to repel a robber, but a crime to invoke their aid for the recovery of the stolen goods?

The Depositions taken in connection with the war of 1641 are a favourite theme of the author. In the little book entitled, *A Short Guide to Some MSS. in Library of Trinity College* fourteen pages out of the sixty-three are devoted to an unconvincing defence of them, while really valuable historical collections in the same library are despatched in a page or two. But to prove that some critics have misunderstood the meaning of the "crossings-out" in the MSS., or that certain incidents mentioned by witnesses are confirmed by contemporary writers, does not establish the trustworthiness of these voluminous depositions as a whole. Neither is it candid to quote men like Peter Walsh or Clanrickarde as if they were representative Catholic witnesses without telling the student that their Catholicity was, to say the least, very dubious and subordinated to political intrigue. Nor is the difficulty that the famous ghost-stories raise against the credibility of the witnesses who bear testimony to them, to be got rid of by saying that "all who read medieval chronicles are aware of the fact that the supernatural soon obtrudes," and that "the investigations of the Society of Psychical Research tend to allow ghosts to come into their own." Other adverse arguments are characteristically omitted—a simpler process of refutation, but one which gives the student a false idea of the actual state of the controversy. If the subject had to be discussed at all in such a book, it should have been treated fully

and impartially. If limitation of space made that impossible, the student should have been given a list of the authorities on both sides and been left to form his own judgment by means of the scientific principles of historical criticism which he could find in Dr. Marshall's book in this same series.

To prove that Catholicism is incompatible with loyalty, he tells us that "in 1662 the Nuncio at Brussels, De Vecchiis, had declared that a proposed address by the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland, stating their loyalty to the new sovereign, was a violation of the Roman Catholic faith"; but he conceals quite unfairly from the student the fact that the said clergy were prepared to sign an address of loyalty that went as far as any address by Christians should go, and that the proposed address was not condemned for its statement of loyalty to the new sovereign, but because it contained in addition unCatholic doctrines purposely inserted and insisted on. After this we are not surprised at being told that the struggle between William of Orange and James II., "represented the eternal struggle between liberty and tyranny," or at finding the old calumny of the Pope's rejoicing at the good news from Ireland when he heard of William's victory at the Boyne.

The Penal Laws are passed over lightly; the bibliography in connection with them is imperfectly given. Though their enactment and enforcement had a profound influence on the home politics and the foreign relations of Ireland in the eighteenth century, these are not mentioned in a list of "the leading features of the Ireland of the 18th century." In spite of their barbarity they are not condemned; indeed, three pages are devoted to their justification. The tolerance of the persecutors is praised, and ways are suggested in which they could have been made more brutally effective. Of course to such a mind "it is almost impossible to resist the conclusion that it was the treason [and not the faith of the Catholics] which was attacked," and "it is obvious that the main reason why the Roman Catholic was not permitted to possess land was because he owed allegiance to the Pope who was then a temporal sovereign."

These examples will show the student what he has to expect on similar issues. The bibliography is good, the rest is overloaded with political and sectarian bias. It is regrettable that the editors of the series did not take care that the high standard of impartiality attained in the other books of the series should be maintained in the two books which would naturally have the greatest interest for our readers.

JOHN MACERLEAN.

Music.

ENGLISH MADRIGAL VERSE, 1588-1632. Edited by E. H. Fellowes. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1920. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

THE ENGLISH SCHOOL OF LUTENIST SONG WRITERS Transcribed, scored and edited by Edmund Horace Fellowes M.A., Mus. Doc. Part I. London: Winthrop Rogers. 1920. 5*s.* net.

TWELVE GOOD MUSICIANS, from John Bull to Henry Purcell. By Sir Frederick Bridge, M.A., Mus.D. London: Kegan Paul. 1920. 5*s.* net.

DICTIONARY OF MUSICAL COMPOSITIONS AND COMPOSERS. By W. Edmund Quarry. London: Routledge. 1920. 5*s.* net.

DR. E. H. Fellowes has done a great service to those interested in the song books of the Elizabethan and Jacobean period, by bringing together under one cover a complete edition of the lyrics from the original part books. This edition includes the lyrics of the Madrigal writers and those of the Lutenists, arranged under the names of the Musical composers in alphabetical order. Modern spelling and punctuation have been adapted for good and sufficient reasons, while obsolete words and curious variants of modern words have been retained, as well as certain Elizabethan forms. Inasmuch as the names of the authors of the lyrics were never given in Elizabethan song books, it has been no easy task to trace the authors, but Dr. Fellowes has been remarkably successful in this direction. In addition to an excellent reconstruction of the text, there are brief but informing notes appended, and an index of first lines. The present volume is a veritable treasury of English lyrics, and it has been handsomely produced by the Clarendon Press.

In the previous volume Dr. Fellowes published the lyrics, but he has now undertaken a much more ambitious work, namely, the publication of "The English School of Lutenist Song Writers," commencing with Dowland's "First Book of Airs," originally issued in 1597. Each song is given in two forms, one with the original lute setting, in modern notation, and the other a modernised version with pianoforte accompaniment. John Dowland, an Irish composer (whose name also appears as Dowlan and Dolan), according to Dr. Fellowes, "stands out as a remarkable personality even in an age which produced more men of mark than any other in English history." It is gratifying to find Dr. Fellowes supporting the present writer's proofs in favour of John Dowland being an Irishman, added to which is the interesting fact that another Irish composer,

Thomas Campion, wrote a charming Latin Epigram for Dowland's First Book, in 1597. The scoring shows a fine discrimination, and Dr. Fellowes preserves to the full the Elizabethan flavour. Of Dowland's genius Dr. Fellowes writes: "He was not only one of the greatest song-writers that this country has ever produced, but he is to be placed unhesitatingly among the world's greatest song-writers of all time." The present instalment gives Nos. 1 to 10 of Dowland's First Book, and it will be followed in due course by the songs of Campion, Rossiter, Jones, Morley, Ford, Corkine, Pilkington, and Attey.

Sir Frederick Bridge's *Twelve Good Musicians* is an amplification of his lectures delivered at London University during the session 1919-1920, and contains many new facts of interest in regard to the biographies of Bull, Byed, Morley, Weelkes, Gibbons, Deering, Milton, Lewes, Locke, Humphrey, Blow, and Purcell. To Irish readers the fresh information as to Henry Purcell's Irish ancestry will be welcome. It seems tolerably certain that Purcell's father, Henry Purcell the Elder, was a native of Co. Tipperary and a near relative of the Baron of Loughmoe.

Quite a handy book for the busy reader is Mr. Quarry's *Dictionary of Musical Compositions and Composers*, with a copious bibliography. It is evident, however, that Mr. Quarry did not consult Mr. O. G. Sonneck's monumental Catalogue of Operas, published at Washington in 1914, a work which for the ground it covers, supersedes Clement and Larousse's *Dictionnaire des Opéras*. Irish compositions seem to have escaped the compiler's range of view, while the Biographical Notes make no mention of John Field, Sir John Stevenson, Sir Robert Stewart, Augusta Holmes, Charles Wood, Dr. Buck, and others. The Classified Bibliography is, however, very full, save for the meagre section on Church Music, and we note at least one book mentioned as published on Irish Music that never saw the light. W. H. Grattan Flood.

Poetry.

THE ROSE OF HEAVEN. Poems by Ella Young. Decorations by Maude Gonne. Dublin: The Candle Press. 1920. 10*s*. 6*d*. net.

It may be that none among the numerous volumes of verse that Irish writers and Dublin publishers have brought out during the last few years has a clearer claim than this of Miss Young's to the praise of genuine inspiration and to the hope of a more than temporary success. For temporary success its contents make no loud appeal. They are eminently other-worldly. For the same

reason they may easily suggest excessive uniformity: very distant hues and outlines tend to mingle into one dim blue. But the fault is with our own eyes or our own remoteness; and so it is too with our slow realization of art that is other-worldly. If it is genuine art, like this of Miss Young's, you will be rewarded for a little patience and attention by gaining the entry to a world of rarefied and intense beauty. Is it a world, after all, of mirage? Even if so, there should be no contempt for a mirage which corresponds so well to the longings of the unsensualized human heart and reflects so much of eternal realities. The thought will perhaps not be always clear, even to those who have drawn close and who apply their faculties. But one feels a confidence that the poet means something and is not merely trying to catch us in a net of pretty words.

One does not resent the proud superscription which heads the book—taken from the Irish Triads:—"Three candles that light up every darkness: Truth, Nature, Knowledge." These three things are elusive as well as beautiful—so the artist may plead.

But some, at least, of these fourteen poems have a beauty which is nowise thin or unsubstantial. They may well catch and hold the attention even of a hasty reader. Take, for example, this piece, called (in common with several others) *The Rose.* It will be hard to find among all the poetic parallels a more beautiful impression of dawn.

The stars were lilies,
Each lifting a face
Out of the glimmering
Dusk of space.

The winds were dragons
Haughtily curled
About the sleeping
New-born world.

But the sun-rose blossomed
Golden and red,
And the young earth lifted
A laughing head.

The pale star-lilies
Dared not stay:
Their dusk lake-water
Ebbed away.

The publisher's part of the work has well aided the inspiration of the text, and the illustrations supply an apt and delicate comment.

G. O'N.

THE NEW RUBAIYAT AND OTHER POEMS. By Condé B. Pallen. London: Harding and More. 1920. 10*s.*

A certain power and vigour of thought mark the best of these pieces. Mr. Pallen is not one of those idle shepherds who sport with Amaryllis in the shade, or with the tangles of Neaera's hair; even his less serious moments are never frivolous, and they are not usually, for poetry, among his best. In his leading poem he protests in some 350 lines against the irrational and irreligious

hedonism of Omar Khayyam and of modern Khayyamists; it might have been only fair to hint that some interpreters have laboured to clear the Persian singer of (at least) the full grossness of the charge that seems to lie against him. Mr. Pallen assails the false prophet in his own metre—we mean that of his noted English translator: it is a venturesome piece of rivalry and does not appear wholly justified by success. Orthodoxy falls metrically and musically below her rival. Fitzgerald never voiced seduction in so un-siren-like a stanza as this:—

> Drink, and clear the phantoms from thy brain,
> Cleanse from thy sluggish blood the lecherous bane
> That poisoned all the wells of life and truth;
> Drink! Look up! And once again be sane.

The drinking commended, it need hardly be remarked, is from a "crystal cup" of contents very different to those which inebriated Omar Khayyam.

This poet achieves the occasional ode for a centenary or festival with adequacy and dignity. Such a piece is "The Raising of the Flag." Its optimist militarism finds a melancholy pendant in a sonnet of patriotic disillusionment—"Retrogression." This sonnet, by the way, lacks a foot in one of its lines. The longer poems include two in dramatic form—"Aglae" and "Thalarchus." (Why not, with Horace, "Thaliarchus"?) They are pitched in a key of sustained intensity which becomes unreal and monotonous, nevertheless there are pages here and there of real beauty.

G. O'N.

Politics and Freemasonry.

MODERN DEMOCRACIES. By Viscount Bryce. Two vols. London: Macmillan. 1921. Pp. 567 and 757. 50*s.* net.

Lord Bryce's great new work, *Modern Democracies*, has satisfied a long-felt want in the domain of political literature. Since the war, and before the appearance of Lord Bryce's work, a large and very interesting literature had appeared on a number of the older constitutions, explaining recent changes in the constitutions themselves, as well as new developments and tendencies of constitutional practice. Thus we had Everett Kimbal's *The National Government of the United States;* E. M. Lait's interesting work *Government and Politics of France;* Bonjour's *Real Democracy in Operation*, dealing with the Swiss Republic, and Duncan Hall's book on the Dominion governments. But these works dealt with particular constitutions only, and they discussed a comparatively narrow group of principles and issues—those, viz., that are usually grouped

under the heading of "constitutional law and practice." The broader and more human questions touching the actual life of peoples—for instance, false developments of liberty, failures and successes in government and their reasons, trade difficulties and how they should be met—these things were not considered, and therefore there was little to help a statesman anxious to look far ahead, to rise above mere party interests, and to put the State on a good footing in the different relations of human life.

In Viscount Bryce's book a genuine attempt is made to supply these omissions. In the first place it is a valuable comparative study of a number of constitutions, old and new; secondly, it contains reflections and practical suggestions on nearly every important problem of modern politics. The book has not perhaps the vigour, the lucidity, the sparkle of the *American Commonwealth* (the author has just completed his eighty-third year); but we have the same encyclopaedic information, the same capacity for broad delineation, the same power of illuminating analogy; above all, the same hold on the realities, the permanent and formidable things in the life of the State as distinct from the transient and unsubstantial things for which active statesmen so often imperil the true public good.

The book has a peculiar value for those peoples who are about to set up constitutions of their own or whose political systems are not yet fully developed. For Viscount Bryce brings to his work information, experience, ripe judgment, and an outlook broader probably than that of any statesman of the English-speaking world. He writes from first-hand knowledge of men, both rulers and ruled. He has travelled widely, has met all sorts and conditions of persons, and so his investigations have not been weakened by narrow associations or traditions nor biassed by special purpose or propaganda. Even those most familiar with the existing constitutions will learn a great deal from these pages about their actual working, while those who are interested in the philosophic principles underlying all State activity have here at their disposal splendid discussions involving the most original thought and the most penetrating judgment on the foundations of the State.

To give a complete account of the varied character of his enquiries would be impossible in a brief review. But we may note in the first volume full accounts of the ancient democracies, of the present French constitution (including valuable sketches of the land and its history), of Swiss politics, federal and cantonal, and of the constitution of Canada, with some reference to the causes of present dissatisfaction. The second volume contains an up-to-date

review of the American constitution, with dissertations on such big questions as the paternalist tendencies of modern republics; an interesting epitome of constitutional law in Australia and New Zealand, and then a number of illuminating studies in which the different forms of government are compared and possible improvements suggested. It is these comparative studies which give to the book its greatest and most distinctive value. They cover not only all the great problems which the war has left the world to solve, but also many which, though their pressure is not felt just now, are certain to become insistent in the years immediately before us. MICHAEL CRONIN.

WELTFREIMAURERREI, WELTREVOLUTION, WELTREPUBLIK. Von Dr. Friedrich Wichtl. Siebente Auflage. München: J. F. Lehmanns Verlag. 1920. M. 22.

DR. Wichtl's book has created a sensation in Austria-Germany. It was published towards the middle of 1919. Before the end of the year it ran through five editions. The preface to the seventh edition is dated Whitsuntide, 1920. It has been attacked by the Lodges with great bitterness, and in very fierce terms; but its charges in the main have not been contradicted, nor its statements called in doubt.

Its purpose is to show that the late European war was brought about by Freemason intrigue, chiefly in France, Italy and England, for the overthrow of the Central Empires, and as a first step towards a world-revolution and one world-wide republic. Most English-speaking readers are probably convinced that the war was entirely due to the ambition of the German Emperor and of his military following; and with such readers Dr. Wichtl's efforts to whitewash the governments of Berlin and Vienna, will not be very successful. If they were the instruments of Freemasonry, they seem to have been very willing instruments.

The interest of the book, however, centres less in the responsibility for the war than in its picture of Freemason influence and activity: and of the control which Jews have come to exercise over the whole Freemason organisation. Dr. Wichtl may fail to prove that the Central Empires have been the victims of an anti-monarchical and anti-Christian conspiracy; but he does make clear that Freemasonry is a widespread and powerful influence, that it is on the whole opposed to the Christian religion, and that in its higher grades it is very largely in the hands of the Jews. In this there is nothing new. Freemason literature is abundant: the Brethren are often singularly outspoken—more especially where

their plans appear to triumph; and they report freely in their books and periodicals what their objects are, and what the means by which they hope to gain them. In France, in Italy, in Portugal and Austria, they make no secret of their designs; and it is from their published declarations that Dr. Wichtl draws his indictment against them. How true it is may be inferred from the storm of anger and abuse which it has evoked. The curious reader will find amusing samples of Freemason criticism, collected by our author in the preface to his fifth edition, and republished in the editions which have followed.

The most interesting section of the book from a Catholic and Irish standpoint is that on Freemasonry in England. It opens with an observation familiar to all students of English history during the last hundred years:—"English Freemasonry is essentially different in one way from Freemasonry in other countries; it does not work for revolution at home; on the contrary, it places itself entirely at the service of the English State, that it may be the better able to help on revolution elsewhere." Those who know anything of England's political action in Spain, Italy, Sicily, Austria and America since the early years of the eighteenth century will agree unhesitatingly with Dr. Wichtl. English Freemasonry, he proceeds to tell us, is the most powerful Masonic organisation in the world. According to the returns of 1918, there are in London alone 729 Lodges, in the provinces 1,749; abroad and in the Colonies 677—all affiliated to the United Grand Lodge of England, and numbering altogether about 450,000 "Brothers."

The Duke of Connaught is Grand Master of the United Grand Lodge of England. He succeeded his brother, the late King Edward VII., who was also Grand Chief Zorobabel, Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Mark Master Masons, Sovereign of the Order of Templars, Patron of the Grand Lodge of Ireland; with a great variety of other titles. And if we may believe Dr. Wichtl, they were not empty titles; they placed in the King's hands an enormous power, which he used zealously for the advancement of English interests, commercial and political. So we can appreciate the boast of "The Freemason's Chronicle" (1902, i. p. 319) that Great Britain is the work of the Freemasons. At present, with one notable exception, almost every non-Catholic of rank and influence in the English-speaking world is member of a Lodge: Mr. Lloyd George apparently is not a "Brother." But the King is; as are also the Prince of Wales, the chief ministers and advisers of the Crown, the heads of the Army and Navy and Civil Administration. If Masonry were merely a social and beneficent institution, measuring

out impartial justice to all—members and non-members of the organisation, the number and position of its adherents would be of small importance to any but Freemasons themselves. As it is, we are all interested ; for Masonry is pledged to the support and defence of the "Brothers" against the uninitiated ; and, where "Brothers" are concerned, fair-play and even justice are often gravely imperilled.

Here in Ireland, Masons, who number about 18,000, would seem to be Home Rulers of a kind ; they owe allegiance to the Grand Lodge of Ireland alone, with headquarters in the "Freemasons' Hall," Molesworth Street, Dublin, and about 510 affiliated Lodges. Dr. Wichtl tells us nothing of the influence which the "Brothers" exercise in Ireland. Some day, it is to be hoped, their history will be published ; and our people will then realise—what they do not realise at present—how we Irish Catholics have suffered at the hands of Irish Freemasonry. Its power is being gradually lessened ; though it has considerably increased in numbers, since the war. Apparently it apprehends danger from the coming Irish Government.[1] And great efforts have been made of late, especially in "Southern Ireland," to draw all non-Catholics into the organisation. Until recently, Masonry told grievously against Catholics in the Civil Service, in our Banks, our Railways, many of our large commercial undertakings, even in the medical and legal professions. The late Sir Francis Cruise was used to say that the most hostile influence he had to fight, as a physician, was Freemasonry ; and many Irish Catholics, who have won success, and many who have failed to win it, would confirm his assertion. Even the Irish Government is generally under the control of Freemasonry ; some explanation, perhaps, of the little sympathy between Government and the Catholic people. The late Viceroy, Lord French, was a Freemason. At one period of his Viceroyalty, almost all the men who dictated his policy, were Freemasons. That policy and the methods to be employed in carrying it out were discussed and decided on, from day to day, in formal or informal gatherings of the "Brothers."

P. F.

[1] Clause 63 of the *Government of Ireland Act*, 1920, reads :— '(1) It is hereby declared that existing enactments relative to unlawful oaths or unlawful assemblies in Ireland do not apply to the meetings or proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of Ireland, or of any lodge or society recognised by that Grand Lodge. (2) Neither the Parliament of Southern Ireland, nor the Parliament of Northern Ireland shall have power to abrogate or affect prejudicially any privilege or exemption of the Grand Lodge of Freemasons in Ireland, or any lodge or society recognised by that Grand Lodge which is enjoyed either by law or custom at the time of the passing of this Act, and any law made in contravention of this provision shall, so far as it is in contravention of this provision, be void.'

Books also received:

ALBERT THE GREAT ... The Paradise of the Soul. Trans. (Burns O. W., 3*s.* 6*d.*).
FR. ALEXANDER ... A Mother's Letters. (Burns, Oates and W., 1*s.* 6*d.*).
PHYLLIS M. BAILEY ... Poems. (Morland, 1*s.* 6*d.*).
GEORGE H. BISHOP ... The Church and her Members. (Burns O. W., 1*s.* 3*d.*).
JUDGE BODKIN ... A Considered Judgment. (Talbot Press, 2*d.*).
B. SANIN CANO ... Spanish Reader. (Oxford University Press, 3*s.* 6*d.*).
FERD. CAVALLERA ... Thesaurus Doctrinae Catholicae. (Beauchesne, 35fr.).
JAMES CONNOLLY ... The Axe to the Root. (I.T.G.W.U., 3*d.*).
AUSTIN CLARKE ... The Fires of Baäl. (Maunsel & Roberts, 3*s.* 6*d.*).
RUTH CLARK ... Anthony Hamilton. Life, Works, Family. (Lane, 21*s.*).
JOSEPH CONRAD ... Notes on Life and Letters. (Dent, 9*s.*).
MGR. DE GIBERGUES ... The Mass and the Christian Life. Trans. (Sands, 3*s.* 6*d.*).
MICHAEL D'HERBIGNY ... La Théologie du Révélé. (Beauchesne, 12fr.).
JOSEPH DONAT ... Ethica. Two vols. (Rauch, M. 20 and 48).
RICHARD DOWNEY ... Some Errors of H. G. Wells. (Burns O. W., 1*s.*).
LYNN DOYLE ... An Ulster Childhood. (Maunsel & Roberts, 4*s.* 6*d.*).
RICHARD ELLISON ... A Wayfaring Man. (Sands, 6*s.*).
IDA FARNELL ... Spanish Prose and Poetry. (Oxford University P., 10*s.* 6*d.*)
W. J. FERRAR ... Demonstratio Evangelica of Eusebius. (S.P.C.K., 30*s.*).
J. D. M. FORD ... Main Currents of Spanish Literature.(Constable, 15*s.*).
R. AUSTIN FREEMAN ... Social Decay and Regeneration. (Constable, 18*s.*).
A. MARTIN FREEMAN ... Vanessa and her Correspondence with Swift. (Selwyn and Blount, 7*s.* 6*d.*).
AGOSTINO GEMELLI ... L'Origine della Famiglia. (*Vita e Pensiero*, L. 5).
THOMAS GERRARD ... The Church and Eugenics. (Catholic Social Guild, 1*s.* 6*d.*).
J. M. HARDEN ... Dictionary of the Vulgate New Testament. (S.P.C.K., 4*s.*)
T. M. HEALY ... The Planter's Progress. (Gill, 2*s.*).
ERNEST HULL ... A Practical Philosophy of Life. (Examiner Press, 1 rupee)
Collapses in Adult Life. (Examiner Press, 8 annas).
"IMAAL" ... Excursions in Thought. (Talbot Press, 6*s.*).
MARIANNE KAVANAGH ... Dante's Mystic Love. (Sands, 4*s.* 6*d.*).
SELSKAR KEARNEY ... The False Finger Tip. (Maunsel & Roberts, 6*s.*).
J. FITZMAURICE KELLY ... Cambridge Readings in Spanish Literature. (C.U.P., 10*s.*).
AN IRISH K.C. ... An Independent Irish Parliament. (Talbot Press, 2*s.* 6*d.*).
MGR. LANDRIEUX ... Le Divin Inconnu. (Beauchesne, 5fr.).
LE DOCTEUR LE BEC. Critique et Contrôle médical des Guérisons surnaturelles. (Beauchesne).
F. LEGGE ... Philosophumena. Translated. (S.P.C.K., 30*s.*).
GUY LE STRANGE ... Spanish Ballads. (Cambridge University Press, 10*s.* 6*d.*).
ROSE LYNCH ... The Story of Lourdes. (Sands, 5*s.*).
JOHN MCCABE ... Matters of Moment. (Burns O. W., 6*s.*).
HUGH A. MACCARTAN ... The Glamour of Belfast. (Talbot Press, 2*s.* 6*d.*).
WILLIAM MILLER ... The Turkish Restoration in Greece, 1718-1797. (S.P.C.K.)
WILLIAM MORAN ... Social Reconstruction in an Irish State. (C.T.S., 9*d.*).
GEORGE O'BRIEN ... Labour Organisation. (Methuen, 5*s.*).
JAMES O'CALLAGHAN ... How to square a circle and trisect an angle. (Educational Co. of Ireland, 5*s.*).
PADRAIC O CONAIRE ... Béal an Uaignis. (Martin Lester, 3*s.* 6*d.*).
BERNARD F. PAGE ... Reading for the Worker. (Burns O. W., 1*s.*).
LUDWIG PASTOR ... Geschichte der Päpste. Bd. VII-VIII. 1559-1572. (Herder, M. 36 and 62).
L. H. PETITOT ... Sainte Jeanne d'Arc. (Beauchesne, 12fr.)
CHARLES PLATER ... A Week-End Retreat. (Sands, 2*s.* 6*d.*).
R. LANE POOLE ... Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought and Learning. (S.P.C.K., 17*s.* 6*d.*).
CHARLES ROBINSON ... Anskar, the Apostle of the North, 801-865. (S.P.G., 4*s.*).
GEORGE SANTAYANA ... Character and Opinion in the U.S. (Constable, 10*s.* 6*d.*).
Little Essays drawn from the Writings of Santayana. (Constable, 12*s.* 6*d.*).
CAROLUS TELCH ... Epitome Theologiae Moralis. (Rauch, 20fr.).
HENRY THOMAS ... Spanish and Portuguese Romances of Chivalry. (Cambridge University Press, 25*s.*).
ST. THOMAS ... Summa Theologica. Secunda Secundae, QQ. 141-170. Trans. (Burns O.W., 12*s.*).
P. V. WASS ... Repetitorium Theologiae Fundamentalis. (Rauch, 15fr.).

(*The prices of all books in this list are net.*)

University College,
DUBLIN.

A Constituent College of
The National University of Ireland.

SESSION 1920-21.

THE College provides Courses for the Degrees of the National University of Ireland in the Faculties of Arts, Philosophy, Celtic Studies, Science, Law, Medicine, Engineering and Architecture, and Commerce.

The following Regulations for the College Courses, etc., may be obtained on application :—

1. General Regulations, Scholarships, Fees.
2. Courses for Degrees in Arts, Philosophy, Celtic Studies.
3. Courses for Degrees in Science.
4. Courses for Degrees in Law.
5. Courses for Degrees in Medicine and Dentistry.
6. Courses for Degrees in Engineering and Architecture.
7. Courses for Degrees in Commerce.

College Scholarships and Prizes to the value of about £3,500 (not including Scholarships provided by the Corporation of Dublin and by the County Councils) are open to competition amongst Student-Members of the College.

Letters in reference to Courses of Study should be addressed to the Registrar of the College, Earlsfort Terrace, or to the Medical School, Cecilia Street. All Students' Fees due to the College are to be paid to the SECRETARY, University College, Dublin.

The College Offices at Earlsfort Terrace and in the Medical School, Cecilia Street, are open daily.

Telegrams—"HOSIERY, DUBLIN." Telephone No. 1292.

KENNEDY & McSHARRY

Shirt Makers, Hosiers, Hatters
and General Outfitters, :: ::

24 WESTMORELAND STREET,
—— And 3 D'OLIER STREET, DUBLIN.

FINEST SMOKING MIXTURES

NO CHANGE IN PRE-WAR QUALITY.

JOHN LEASK, SUCCESSOR TO
GEORGE MITCHELL, LTD.,
Wine and Cigar Merchants,

Telegrams: "MITCHELL, DUBLIN." Telephone 554. 9 D'OLIER ST., DUBLIN.

Telegrams: "WATT, DUBLIN." Telephone: 4268 DUBLIN.

GEORGE WATT, LTD.

Engineers and Millwrights,
Soho Works, Bridgefoot Street,
DUBLIN.

Estimates given for Repair and Supply for all Classes of Machinery.

——FOR HIGH-CLASS——

Cigars, Cigarettes, Fancy Tobaccos, Briar Pipes,
and other Smokers' Requisites—

JOHN PURCELL, LTD., DUBLIN.

Head Office: 16 NORTH EARL STREET.

Branches through the City.

Telephone 1938. Telegrams: "PURCELL, DUBLIN."

You will find it economical to place your orders for

HARDWARE AND IRONMONGERY

with us. We carry a large stock of **Cutlery, Household Utensils, Garden Tools,** and **Builders' Ironmongery.** Quality and price right.

GLEESON, O'DEA & CO., LTD.,

21 & 22 CHRISTCHURCH PLACE, DUBLIN. Telephone: Dublin, 261.

TODD, BURNS & CO.

LIMITED.

High-Class TAILORING

TO ORDER.

SUITS and OVERCOATS

READY TO WEAR.

Gentlemen's OUTFITTING

IN ALL REQUIREMENTS.

Furniture, Carpets, Linoleums

IN BEST QUALITIES.

MARY STREET, DUBLIN.

BEST HOUSE COALS. BEST GAS COKE.

Dublin General Steam Shipping Co.

Limited,

COAL IMPORTERS,

18 D'OLIER STREET, DUBLIN.

Telephone 336 and 402. Telegrams: "WALLSEND," DUBLIN

Why you should buy

"THE HALL" POLISHES

Because—

They are made in Ireland.

They are the best in quality and give the best and quickest results.

They cost no more than imported polishes and are more economical in use.

BOOT POLISH,

Sold everywhere in tins at **2d., 4d.,** and **6d.**

FLOOR POLISH,

Sold everywhere in tins at **4d., 8d.,** and **1/4**

REGISTERED IRISH
TRADE MARK 0681

METAL POLISH,

Sold everywhere in tins at

4d., 8d., 10½d.

You cannot buy better polishes than these. They are made by the well-known firm of

HUGH MOORE & ALEXANDER, Ltd.,

THE LINEN HALL, DUBLIN.

McC.

Clerical Tailors.

CLERY'S DUBLIN

Complete Outfitters.

Our Cutters are Specialists in CLERICAL TAILORING.

COLLARS, SHIRTS, UNDERWEAR, STOCKS, HATS, BOOTS, CUFFS, GLOVES, BAGS, &c. : : : :
Sole Agents for the "GLOBE-WERNECKE" BOOKCASES.

ILLUSTRATED CLERICAL LIST ON REQUEST.

CLERY & CO., LTD., DUBLIN.

Vestments and Banners

As a result of the Great War and consequent difficulty of securing Vestment Embroideries from the Continent, we have installed Three New Machines, driven by electricity, and have skilled operators executing most elaborate and elegant Embroidery, equal both in workmanship and price to those heretofore imported from the Continent.

We are anxious for your kind patronage, as we are specialists in Vestments and all materials connected with same.

We will at all times be pleased to submit on approbation, post free, a selection of Vestments, Ornaments, Braids, Fringes and Silks, of which we always carry a large and varied stock.

C. BULL, LTD., 21 Suffolk St., DUBLIN.

PRINTED BY SEALY, BRYERS & WALKER, DUBLIN.